The University of Chicago

THE JEWISH APOLOGETIC TO THE GRECIAN WORLD IN THE APOCRYPHAL AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL LITERATURE

Thy sons, O Zion,
against thy sons, O Greece.—Zech. 9:13

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION)

BY

ISAAC GEORGE MATTHEWS

CHICAGO
1914

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

3781
C53M
UNCLASSED
Disse-tation

The University of Chicago

THE JEWISH APOLOGETIC TO THE GRECIAN WORLD IN THE APOCRYPHAL AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL LITERATURE

Thy sons, O Zion,
against thy sons, O Greece.—Zech. 9:13

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION)

BY

ISAAC GEORGE MATTHEWS

CHICAGO
1914

The University of Chicago

THE JEWISH APOLOGETIC TO THE GRECIAN WORLD IN THE APOCRYPHAL AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL LITERATURE

Thy sons, O Zion,
against thy sons, O Greece.—Zech. 9:13

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION)

BY

ISAAC GEORGE MATTHEWS

CHICAGO
1914

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PAGE

Environment, Formative in Hebrew Life 1
Canaan, Phoenicia, Assyria, Babylonia, and Persia Each Made a Contribution. Greek Thought and Life, Subtly Pervasive in All Phases of Activity.

I. THE INDIRECT APOLOGETIC SEEN IN THE JEWISH ADAPTATION TO THE GREEK ENVIRONMENT

The Adoption of the Greek Language Had Very Important Issues. . . 4
LXX. Translated, Widespread Literary Activity.
Philosophic Terminology—Ethical, Cosmological, Theological, Psychological, Ecclesiastical—Introduced.
General Literary Tendencies—Literary Forms, Pseudepigraphy, Interpolations, Forged Letters, Exuberant Apocalyptic—Developed.
Allegory as a Method of Interpretation Was Perfected.

The Contact with the Social Life and Customs of the Greeks Changed the Outlook and Colored the Ideals of the Hebrews. 15
The Stadium, Hippodrome, Gymnasia, Theater, Agora, Architecture, Government, and Religion, All Left Their Influence on the Subject People.

II. THE JEWISH ANSWER TO THE VARIOUS ATTACKS

The Attacks on the Nation 19
Lacking in Antiquity; a Leprous and Slave Race; Barbarous and Uncultured; Fellow-Haters and Bad Citizens.

The Attacks on Their Religion 25
The Ritual; Circumcision; Sabbath; Idolatry; Human Sacrifice; Atheism.

III. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Hebrew Thought Restated in Terms of Grecian Philosophy . . . 28

A. COSMOLOGY

The Greek Cosmogonies Were a Growth. 28
The Hebrews Though Not Interested in Cosmogony *per se*, Took Over the General Semitic Ideas.

Development in the Interbiblical Period 30
Conception More Orderly; Greek Words Appropriated; Ideas of Harmony; Creation out of Passive Matter; Medium of Creation, and Archetypal Ideas.

B. PSYCHOLOGY

PAGE

The Greek Idea Contrasted with the Hebrew 34
Greek Influence Seen in Dichotomy and Trichotomy; Pre-Existence; Immortality; Freedom of the Will, and Conscience.

C. ETHICS

The Messages of the Prophets Still Have Their Exponents, but the Greek Cultural Movements Are Infectious 46
The Love of Beauty; the Attitude toward Woman; Desire for Name and Fame; the Cardinal Virtues of the Platonists; the Attitude toward Truth, and the Idea of the Sacredness of Life Show the Influence of the Greeks.

D. THEOLOGY

Greek Speculation, the Result of Centuries of Development 56
To the Hebrews the Existence of God Was Axiomatic.
Readjustment Is Made to the Philosophic Outlook of the Greeks . . 57
Transcendency Emphasized, Names and Characteristics of Deity.
No Place for Idolatry.
Providence.
System of Intermediaries, Angelology, Logos.
Revelation Idea. The Literature Is Accredited by Evidence of Inspiration of the Media of Revelation, Appeal to the Content.

INTRODUCTION

Environment is one of the potent channels of influence in the life of any people. Most potent is that of the life and thought of a dominant nation. The Hebrews were always susceptible to outside influences. In their early history they readily adapted themselves to their surroundings. While throughout they maintained their identity and carried forward the noblest of their early religious convictions, they always took on the color of their immediate situation. To them the crucible of international struggle was the melting-pot in which their religious ideals were purified.

Many of their early leaders strenuously opposed any assimilation of Canaanitish life or thought. Later they became not only agriculturists, but, along with that, the functions of the Baal of the land were appropriated to Yahweh (Hos. 2:8). As the austerity of the desert life gave way before the softening influence of an advancing civilization, the conception of deity likewise became more cultural. Through contact with Phoenicia, a commercial, seacoast people, Israel gained her first glimpse of a larger world life, and thus laid the foundation for her later world-outlook.

Contact with Assyria widened still further the horizon of their leaders. The choice spirits who were carried to Babylon from Judah in 597 maintained their integrity. But Babylon was a school in which they learned much. Ritual was systematized and intensified. General customs were adopted. History was reinterpreted. The Babylonian calendar was accepted. Literary form was influenced and words received new content. Cosmological ideas were reordered. Laws and religious feasts, which earlier had been related to natural events, as seasons, etc., are now made statutory and commemorative of supernatural religion. The conception of God was liberalized. Great spiritual conceptions were deepened and broadened. The ideas of a great religious commonwealth and a great world-missionary obligation were born. New conceptions and new forms of activity were produced under the demand of these new conditions. An intense loyalty to the God of their fathers was now poured into a mold, which was the result of their Babylonian experience.

Persian influence likewise was not a dead letter. Eschatological ideas seem at least to have gathered some color from Persian thought

and symbolism. The symbolism of the beasts, this present evil world as over against the world to come (Isa., chaps. 24–27; Zech., chaps. 12–14, etc.), the seven heavens (Slav. En., chaps. 3–21; T. Levi 2:7—3:3; IV Esdr. 8:81 f.), the *shema* at the temple every dawn, the destruction of the world by fire, the one thousand or six thousand years of eschatology (Jub. 4:30; Slav. En. 32:2; 33:1), angelology and dualism, all helped to color the Jewish thought and phraseology. Some of these ideas, though perhaps of Babylonian origin (cf. Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 538; Söderblom, *La vie future d'après le Mazdéisme*, 223 f.) were direct importations from Persia. It is quite probable also that certain oriental folk tales received a strong impress from Persian sources before they were adopted by the Jews (e.g., Achichar, Tobit, Esther). Certain laws also, as leprosy, seem to show the influence of Persian customs (Fairweather, *Background of the Gospels*, 46–50). No more striking testimony, however, to the widespread cultural dominancy of this people is found than that preserved in the far-famed tombstone of Antiochus V, which bears evidence to the presence of Mithras-worship in the West (cf. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés rel. aux mystères de Mithra*, II, 89, 187).

Of chief significance to us, however, is the Grecian influence on Jewish thought. Judaism was in many ways at this time most susceptible to the type of influences which now surrounded it. To many of their leaders, owing to the irony of the past, the hope of a material kingdom was on the wane. Distressing oppressions and unfulfilled predictions gave birth to a deepened religious sense which was now ready to spiritualize the old idea of the Davidic kingdom.

From the time of Alexander, the Greeks and the Grecian culture surrounded them on every side. The caravans passing through the land were chiefly Greek. Greek colonies were everywhere. The Greek soldier, the officer of the law, and the tax-gatherer were familiar figures in the streets of all Jewish villages and cities. Greek sanctuaries with their devotees and regular worship were in all parts of the land. Greek architecture, with its stately columns and graceful, simple outlines, was the vogue where once the less beautiful structures of Syrian and Egyptian form had ruled. The social life of the Greek, with its decorous affability and inviting luxury, as well as the splendor of the foreign court, breathed a new atmosphere over the bare heights of Judah. The *epheboi* with his *chlamys*, and the peripatetic philosopher with his mantle, moved with their air of romance and charm among the busy throng of the market. While persecutions at times did break out against the

subject people, on the whole their overlords bestowed favors and privileges on them, which more than reconciled many to the rule of the conqueror.

Thus gradually, from the third century on, the Greeks commanded more and more completely the life-interests of all those nations which they had vanquished by arms. In the second century the sway of Hellenic culture was all but complete throughout their vast domains. The most stubborn, and the last of all to yield, were the Jews. Their last stand was made in the realm of religion. By many the Greek inroads were long held at bay. Certain influences were never permitted to affect Jewish thought. Yet the inevitable happened. Slowly, even unconsciously, the encroachment of the enemy is seen, and more or less completely the culture of the conquerors, even in things religious, won its sway over the minds of the people. Much of this came as a matter of course. The influence of the Greek was subtly pervasive. They were a people even more noted for their philosophies than for their conquests. No wall could be built to withstand effectively this thought-atmosphere. The Diaspora, which extended from inner Asia to Gibraltar, was not the least important element in the readjustment of the Jewish life and thought to that of the Greek ideal (Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 69–83; Siegfried, *Philos.*, 2–5; Matter, *Hist. de l'école d'Alex.*, 1–3).

In the following chapter there will be discussed the chief features which the Jewish people, in part consciously and in part unconsciously, adopted from their Greek neighbors, and which paved the way for the later and more conspicuous apologetic.

I

THE INDIRECT APOLOGETIC SEEN IN THE JEWISH ADAPTATION TO THE GREEK ENVIRONMENT

The adoption of the language of their masters was the first important movement in this direction. The susceptibility of the Jews in this regard was earlier illustrated by their use of the Canaanitish script in the early days of the kingdom, their later appropriation of the Aramaic language in exilic and post-exilic times, as seen both in Syria and Elephantiné, and by the still later adoption of the Aramaic square character for their writing. It would seem that the first generation after the conquest of 332 B.C. must have become somewhat acquainted with the language of the foreigners. Intermarriage with the Greeks, which, through various prohibitions (Jub. 20:4; 22:20; 25:1–10; 30:7, 10, 11; cf. I Macc. 1:15; Tob. 3:8) we learn was not uncommon, would promote it. It was the language of the army, the language of the new commerce, and the language of the court. It was the medium of the finest learning of the day. The profit to be derived from the knowledge of Greek, in both the social and the commercial world, would be a strong incentive toward its use and mastery. Every phase of public life gave a growing familiarity with it. To the Diaspora it was the *lingua franca* of the business world.

Thus through the language was opened the door to some of the most momentous results in the religious thinking of the Jews. Not the least of these was the translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek. Hausrath succinctly expresses the apologetic character of this work when he says: It was "the first apostle to go out into all the world and teach all people" (Hausrath, *Hist. of N.T. Times*, I, 141). On the whole, it seems more likely that this work was the result of a movement from within Judaism herself, born of a desire to minister to her own Greek-speaking adherents, than that it was primarily initiated by a literature-loving king of Egypt. There may have been opposition from the more orthodox Jews at first, but in the course of two centuries the Septuagint was fully accepted as bearing the divine oracles and as on a par with the Hebrew itself (Schürer, *Hist. Jew. Peop.*, II, 3, 163).

From the time of the beginning of this most significant work of translation we find the Greek language a most acceptable literary medium

of the Jews. Naturally the Diaspora of Alexandria contributed the larger quota to this activity. The importance of this movement to Jewish life and thought is indicated by the abundance of literature which in this period emanated from Jewish pens.

The fragments of the Sibylline Oracles, the additions to Daniel and Esther, the Prayer of Manasseh, II Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, Slavonic Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, III and IV Maccabees, IV Esdras, besides the works of Josephus, Philo, Aristeas, Aristobulus, and a host of others to whom we have only the barest references, all attest the popularity and activity of writers in Greek. Further, the same conclusion is reached by the fact that all the books which were originally written in a Semitic language were speedily translated into the Greek, and thus preserved.

Indeed, so completely did the new language gain acceptance among the dispersion, that very early it was admitted as a legitimate language for most of the functions of worship. The priestly benediction and a few special passages of Scripture, as the *Tephillim* and *Mezuzoth*, only were reserved for use exclusively in the Hebrew (Mishna, *Sota*, VII:1, 2; *Megilla*, I:8; Schürer, *Hist. Jew. Peop.*, II, 2, 284). A significant fact is that from this early period there has not been found a single instance in which Hebrew is the language used for tombstone epitaphs (Schürer, *Hist. Jew. Peop.*, II, 2, 284). The building of a temple, which was modeled after that in Jerusalem, on Grecian soil, in 160 B.C., and the introduction of the Jewish ritual there, indicate the readjustment on the part of the Jews to the new Grecian situation (Schürer, *Hist. Jew. Peop.*, II, 2, 288).

A very definite evidence of the way the Jews adopted the culture of their neighbors is seen by the fact that they took over many Greek names. The Hebrew people had always been ready to pay a compliment to a foreign nation through this use of their language. Gad (Gen. 30:11), Samson (Judg., chap. 13), Kush (Zeph. 1:1), Zerubbabel (Hag. 1:12), Mordecai (Esth. 2:7), Bigvai (Neh. 7:7)—and the non-Jewish names borne by the Jews in Elephantiné—all attest this fact.

The following proper names, which are either Grecianized Hebrew, or pure Greek, are illustrations of the fact that this tendency became quite common in these later days: Alcimus (I Macc. 7:5; 9:54, *et al.*), perhaps the Grecianized form of Eliakin; Jason (I Macc. 8:17) Grecianized from Joshua; Onias (II Macc. 3:5), for Jonah; Jannaeus for Jonathan (Jos., *Ant.*, XIII, xii).

Of names which are pure Greek are these examples: Aristobulus

(II Macc. 1:10), Eupolemus (I Macc. 8:17; II Macc. 4:11), Lysimachus (II Macc. 4:29, 39, 40), Menelaus (II Macc. 4:23), Ptolemy (I Macc. 16:11), Dositheus (II Macc. 12:19, 24), Sosipater (II Macc. 4:27), Rhodocus (II Macc. 13:21), Razis (II Macc. 14:37), Antipater (I Macc. 12:16), Epaphroditus (Jos., *Ant.*, pref.), Dorotheus (Arist. 182, 183, 186). Greek names were so much in favor before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes that later it was said, "The names of Israelites outside of Palestine are like those of the Gentiles" (*Jre. Gitt.*, 43*b*).

In a less measure the same is true as to place names: Aphaerema (I Macc. 11:34), Accaron (I Macc. 10:89). This feature is particularly striking in the cases where we find a city changing its old name in favor of a new Greek one. Haleb became Beroea; Nisibis became Antioch, and Acco became Ptolemais (Bevan, *Jerus. under the H. Priests*, 34). Sebaste was the Grecian name given to Samaria after it had been rebuilt and re-peopled by the Macedonians.

The names of the months likewise suffered change. The early Canaanitish nomenclature had been somewhat displaced by Babylonian influence. As Abib had given way before Nisan, so Nisan is now supplanted by Xanthicus of the Macedonians (II Macc. 11:30, 38). In general, while the old month names, Elul (I Macc. 14:27), Shebat (I Macc. 16:14), Adar (I Macc. 7:43, 49), Adar-Sheni (I Macc. 9:3), Chislev (I Macc. 1:54), and also the newer Babylonian terminology, First (I Macc. 9:3), Second (I Macc. 9:54), Seventh (I Macc. 10:21), Ninth (I Macc. 4:52), Twelfth (II Macc. 15:36), still obtain, yet for the sake of adaptation to the environment, new Greek names are introduced. Xanthicus (II Macc. 11:30, 33, 38) is the sixth month of the Macedonian calendar. Dioscorinthius (II Macc. 11:21; cf. Tob. 2:12; Addit. Esth. 13:6) is either incorrect for Δεὺς Κορινθίου, perhaps for the first month of the Macedonian year, or for Διοσκυροῦ, the third month of the Cretan calendar (Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, I, 147). The source of Pachon (III Macc. 6:38), the name used in Alexandria for the month May 25–June 24, and Epiphi (III Macc. 6:38), the name for the following month, can only be conjectured. They were apparently accepted from Alexandria and may have been of Egyptian origin (cf. Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, I, 173).

Greek coinage names are now freely used as: talent, mina (I Macc. 15:18), drachma (II Macc. 12:43). These, later, gave place again to the Roman as, quadrans, and denarius.

The Greek names for musical instruments likewise found their way into the Hebrew vocabulary at an early date. Cithara (LXX Ps. 80:2;

I Macc. 4:24), psalterion (Wisd. of Sol. 19:18; Ecclus. 40:21), tympanum (LXX Judg. 11:34; Exod. 15:20; Jud., chap. 3; I Macc. 9:39) were in use in the third century B.C.

In Slavonic Enoch we have the Greek names of the planets, Kronos, Aphrodite, Ares, Zeus, Hermes, Selene, Helios, and the order preserved is in partial agreement with that of the Greek physicists (Slav. En. 30: 3–5; cf. Cicero *De Div.* ii. 43). The author of "Wisdom" has an accurate knowledge of the terms of Greek science, and considers instruction therein to be the work of God (Wisd. of Sol. 7:17–22).

One of the most important contributions of the Greek language to the Jew, however, was its philosophic terminology. With its numerous synonyms and its fine distinctions it made possible an advance in thought which was prohibited by the meagerness of the Hebrew. Ideas such as friendship, conscience, virtue, deathlessness, etc., which to the Jew had existed only in the concrete example, could now be definitely expressed by a single word.

A more varied and a vastly different ethical vocabulary was now at hand. Moderation, ambition, leisure, fame, and freedom from passion are in part the ideals of the Greeks, and their phrases respond adequately to their thought. The fundamental virtues which the Hebrew expressed by derivatives of such roots as: אהב, אמן, בין, חסד, חכם, ידע, ירא, נחם, צדק, קדש, שלם, שפט, were now re-expressed by more numerous and more definite terms as: *ἀγαθός, ἀρετή, ἀνδρεία, ἅγιος, ἀταραξία, ἁγνός, ἀλήθεια, γνῶσις, δικαιοσύνη, εὐσεβεία, εὐλογιστία, ἐγκρατεία, θαρσέω, ἱερός, κάλλος, ὅσιος, παιδεία, πίστις, σεμνός, σοφία, φρόνησις, χάρις.*

A substantial contribution is also made in words of cosmological significance: *αἶδης, ἀμόρφου ὕλης, δεμιουργεῖν, διοικεῖν, κόσμος.*

Very numerous and significant were the terms now adopted which were used to characterize the Deity. The most important are: *ἀνάγκη, εἱμαρμένη, ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας, δεσπότης, δημιουργός, δυνάστης, λόγος, σοφία, μέγιστος, μόναρχος, πρόσωπον, πανοῦργος, παντοκράτωρ, ὑπόστασις, ὕψιστος, χάρισμα.*

Perhaps more significant still is the terminology found in the field of psychology. The Greeks were the philosophers of antiquity. The Hebrew Wisdom literature is an indication that intellectual leaven was at work among the Jews. The founder of the ethico-intellectual system of Stoicism was a Jew. The Greek in return now hands his nation an adequate terminology for their growing intellectual conceptions. The liberal extent to which they availed themselves of this is seen by the use of words such as the following: *ἀθανασία, ἀθάνατος, ἀφθαρσία, ἐπιφανεία,*

εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, γνῶσις, πίστις, παιδεία, μυεῖσθαι, μυστήριον, νοῦς, φρήν, φρόνησις, φωτίζειν, συνείδησις, πνεῦμα, ψυχή.

Words of an official character, either secular or ecclesiastical, are found. Some of those of an ecclesiastical significance are: τέλειος, μύστης, συνέδριον, while γηρουσία, ἔφεβοι, refer to the secular side of life.

Literary influences of a much more general and wide-sweeping type than those noticed above were at work. χαίρειν (I Macc. 12:6; II Macc. 1:10; 9:19; 11:34; III Macc. 3:12; 7:1), the Greek epistolary greeting, is now found side by side with, or supersedes, the old Hebrew שלום.

The Greek chronological system, the first really satisfactory one used by the Jews, finds its way into common use as early as the time of the writing of I Maccabees (I Macc. 1:10). Henceforth the beginning of the Seleucid era, 312 B.C., forms a customary starting-point.

As early as Ben Sirach, divisions were made in dissertations in accordance with Greek custom, and appropriate chapter titles were inserted (Ecclus. 18:30; 20:27; 23:7; 24:1; 30:1, 16; 44:1; 51:1; cf. *Jew. Enc.* on "Sirach"). This is the earliest known illustration of this in the writing of a Hebrew. Here again, and in the translation of Esther, the writer or scribe appends his full signature, as was common in Grecian literature.

Greek literary forms and ideas also quite naturally displaced those of the Hebrew. For the first time in their experience a Jew wrote history for its own sake. Demetrius Phalereus, the elder Philo, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Aristobulus (cf. Drummond, *Phil. Jud.*, I, 236), Josephus, and the author of I Maccabees, were all in the line of succession of such writers as Herodotus and Diodorus, rather than the followers of those religious historians who wrote Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. Epistolography, though no new thing to the Hebrew, now flourished under the patronage of a letter-writing people. Aristeas, Heraclitus, Diogenes seem with reasonable certainty to be the names of Jews who were noted for their letters (Schürer, *Hist. Jew. Peop.*, III, 2, 306–20). Beyond this we have a number of epistles in the various historical books (cf. Ezra-Nehemiah, Esdras, II and III Maccabees).

We know that to the Greek *literati* the style was often of greater importance than the content. Hence to the Jew the form became very significant. Greek figures of speech were appropriated. Contrarieties which smack of the Aristotelian method are found in Ben Sirach (Ecclus. 33:7–15). The stoic paradox is illustrated in IV Maccabees (7:23; 14:2), and an excellent example of the familiar rhetorical sorites is found

in the Wisdom of Solomon (7:17–20). This book itself is a good illustration of an effort toward literary style rather than the presentation of a logical discussion of the theme. Much of its background, as the forgetfulness of 16:11, which is apparently Lethean, and the argument from design in 13:1, is decidedly Grecian.

A noticeable tendency is that toward new poetical forms. Greek rhythm now displaces the Hebrew parallelism and assonance. Only remnants of what seems to have been a very wide literary activity have been preserved to us. Theodotus is known to us only by a mere fragment of his poem on Sichem, which has been preserved in Eusebius (*Praep. evang.*, IX, 22).

Ezekiel, the tragic poet of perhaps the second century B.C., is the only dramatist of whom we have any reference. Fragments of his drama of the Exodus have come down to us, again through Eusebius (*Praep. evang.*, IX, 28; XXIX, 4–6, 11, 13). Here the scriptural story of the Exodus, with some embellishments, is dramatized in iambic trimeter.

Philo, the poet of the second century, was the author of an epic poem on Jerusalem, which was written in good hexameter, imitating the Homeric verse (Euseb., *Praep. evang.*, IX, 20, 24, 37). The same measure is found in much of the far-famed Sibylline Oracles. It is interesting to note that Duhm would find an imitation of the same movement in Isa. 26:1–19 (*Enc. Bib.* 3803).

Pseudepigraphy is again one of the direct results of this national contact. The necessity of the situation compelled it. Many names of the past were greatly honored. During the closing centuries of the period there were to the pious leaders but few breathing spaces from some terror within or without. To meet the need, the world-order was interpreted apocalyptically. The ruling nation hence must always be overthrown. Such a hope spread broadcast would bring upon its author the charge of treason. Nor could a living man inspire his own generation so well as one of the Fathers. For three centuries or more the idea of a Canon of Scripture had been rapidly crystallizing, and this made it growingly difficult for the living voice to gain a sympathetic audience (cf. Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, II, viii f.). So this double need opened the door wide for the names of those specially worthy. Moses, Elijah, Enoch were names with which to conjure. The Twelve Patriarchs are called upon to utter their forecast of the future while ostensibly blessing their various tribes. Noah, Solomon, Isaiah, Manasseh, Jeremiah, Baruch, all have their scope enlarged by the method used in these religious crises.

Further, the use of heathen names seems to have been resorted to for the purpose of bearing favorably to a hostile people the religious ideals of the writers. Schürer (*Hist. Jew. Peop.*, II, 3, 316 f.) gives a number of cases in which a Greek name seems to be the doorway through which over-zealous Jews made their entrance to the reading public. Work of the same type and for the same purpose is done by Pseudo-Aristeas and Pseudo-Hecataeus (Schürer, *Hist. Jew. Peop.*, II, 3, 313).

Jewish interpolations in old Grecian writers are of frequent occurrence. This is seen in Phocylides (vss. 84, 85, 139, 147, 148*a*). Forged letters (I Macc. 6:10–15; II Macc. 9:12–17; 11:16–33) were also produced for the same purpose. Fiction, as found in III Maccabees, which may be called a religious novel, having for its subject the triumph of the Jews over their enemies through divine intervention, thus presenting a series of incredible fables, was invented to meet the needs of the day. The most significant example of this type of work is, however, seen in the Sibylline Oracles.[1] This is the climax of propaganda under a heathen mask. It most emphatically indicated how completely the Jew had been brought under the spell of his conquerors and, on the other hand, how aggressive he was in the publishing of his own convictions.

To the same exigencies as those which produced pseudepigraphy we owe the abundant apocalyptic material of this age. The roots of this literature go back to the early conceptions of the day of Yahweh. The unfulfilled hopes of national prosperity, which had been stimulated by the prophets, prepared the way for the idea of the world to come. Persia had contributed something in symbol and conception. Now the hopelessness of the nation in her own strength and the need of a secret code which only the initiated might read caused a rapid development and elaboration along these lines. Under this guise history was rewritten. Daniel, Enoch, Twelve Patriarchs, the Book of Jubilees, the Assumption of Moses, the Ascension of Isaiah, Baruch, and Slavonic Enoch suggest or sketch earlier history of the chosen people, and hope greatly to comfort the stricken nation by the vision of world-victory for them in the immediate future through the power of their God. Primarily this was all strongly apologetic. Its great task was to keep alive the faith of the people by squaring the promises of the prophets with the

[1] The contention of Geffcken in *Untersuchung d. Komposition und Entstehung der Oracula Sibylline*, to the effect that the Sibyl had at an earlier time been appropriated by the Babylonians and that through them the Hebrews were influenced, even if proven, which is rather a difficult proposition, would scarcely affect this statement. Not until the Greek period have we any literary result from such influence.

present crushing calamities. To the apocalyptists the hopelessness of the present was nearing the end, and the future was brighter than the most glowing expectations. Yahweh would keep faith with his people. These writers were interpreters, not only of the times, but also of the Scriptures. Ezek., chaps. 38, 39, Joel, Zech., chaps. 9–14, Isa., chaps. 24–27, furnished a broad basis for elaboration. The seventy years of Jeremiah is a time-connotation which has to be reinterpreted many times (Jer. 29:10; cf. Dan. 9:2; 9:25, 27; En. 89:59; IV Esdr. 12: 11, 12; Ep. Jer., vs. 3). Weeks, generations, periods, times, and millennia are among the resources of the apologists whereby chronology may be definite enough for the comfort of the present generation and vague enough to be manipulated by following ages.

The most decidedly apologetic move from the literary standpoint is found, however, in the use of allegory as a system of scriptural interpretation. The Hebrew was not unfamiliar with allegory as a medium of conveying his message. Instances of this are preserved in the Old Testament. But as a method of interpretation with universal application he was innocent of it. Midrash was the post-exilic method of bringing Scripture up to date. However, allegory as a thoroughgoing system for exegetical purposes was found ready to hand. It was a method which had been the result of a great need. The cultured Greeks could neither literally accept the crude mythologies of earlier days, nor could these with their wealth of tradition and poetry be banished from the minds of the people. This early literature, which was so rooted in the thinking of the common people, could be given value by the cultured only as they found in it some deep fundamental truth. Hence was born that system which can find the message it wants in any literature. In the sixth century B.C. this method was applied to Homer by Theogenes of Rhegium. This was an apology for the poetry of Homer. The Sophists applied the same method very widely, and Aristotle did not entirely shun it. In the fifth century Anaxagoras controlled by the same movement, asserted that Homer's subject was in reality virtue or righteousness. In the hands of Metrodorus of Lampsacus, who was his pupil, Heré, Athene, and Zeus were conceived of as purely physical principles. The Cynics elaborated the method, and the Stoics made it their system *par excellence*. By them all the old superstitions were made to do full duty in supporting their own tenets. To Chrysippus, Zeus was the same as λόγος, Ares was equal to war, etc. (cf. Siegfried, *Philo v. Alex.*, 8–24; Adams, *Relig. Teachers of Greece*, 13; Geffcken, art. "Allegory," *Enc. Relig. and Eth.*).

Hence it is not surprising that a method which has of necessity been introduced by most people who have canonized and literalized their ancient scriptures (this is evidenced by the use of the Vedas and the Koran, as well as that of Homer), should be heartily adopted by the Jew for the purpose of interpreting his own scriptures. It was the scientific method of the day, and proved to be particularly useful for the purpose of reconciling the Pentateuch with Grecian philosophy. Almost everything, says Philo, or most things in the legislation are related allegorically (*De Jos.*, II, 46).

The thorough adoption of it as a method of exegesis was a somewhat slow process. Clear traces of its influence are found in the Wisdom of Solomon. Here the serpent is allegorized into the devil (Wisd. of Sol. 2:24), the robe of the high priest is made out of the cosmos (Wisd. of Sol. 18:24), and *σοφία*, in the tenth chapter, is the guard and guide of the Patriarch and of the early nation (Wisd. of Sol. 10:17). The brazen serpent of the wilderness is a symbol of salvation (Wisd. of Sol. 16:5, 7) and the pillar of salt that of an unbelieving soul (Wisd. of Sol. 10:7). The darkness over Egypt was only a symbol of a deeper spiritual darkness (Wisd. of Sol. 17:21), and Hades is personified (Wisd. of Sol. 1:14). In IV Maccabees are a few traces of the same treatment. The seven days of creation represented the seven Maccabean leaders (IV Macc. 14:8), and the serpent tempting Eve in the garden of Eden is but the impulse of the will (IV Macc. 18:8). Slavonic Enoch finds in the Greek letters of the name Adam, the proof that the first man was formed from substances from the four corners of the earth (Slav. En. 30:13; cf. Sibyl. Or., III, 24–26).

Aristeas makes some use of allegory. In interpreting the law and defending it against the attacks of the Greeks he held that abstinence from certain foods stood for spiritual abstinence from violence, evil practices, etc. (Aristeas 144–50). In the permission to eat certain animals there was a deeper significance than that which might appear on the surface. It was an injunction to practice religious meditation (Aristeas 160). Likewise Aristobulus is reported by Origen to have made use of allegory (*Cont. Celsus*, IV, 51).

While undoubtedly there was quite general appreciation and a not infrequent adoption of this Stoic principle of interpretation, it was left to Philo to perfect it as a system and apply it in the most thoroughgoing way to the Old Testament Scriptures. Philo was a Pharisee, and hence a legalist. At the same time he was trained and saturated in Greek philosophy. Steeped in the thought of his own day, yet for

the literature and the religion of his fathers he had the greatest zeal. These extremes of thought he bridges in a way satisfactory to himself by the application of allegory to all those features in the Scriptures which did not literally meet with his approval. He goes farther. Those features which superficially seem only to be commonplace or otherwise insignificant, inasmuch as to him they are divine oracles, must have some inner spiritual significance, which is hidden only to those whose eyes are holden (Philo, Yonge's translation, I, 18, 33, 41, 52, 166, 192, 194, 284; II, 23, 41, 57, 64; III, 16, 109, 136; IV, 253, 26, 284, *et al.*).

As Philo is the thoroughgoing exponent both of Grecian thought and interpretative method, a few glimpses of his system may here be given by way of illustration. His general attitude toward the letter of Scripture may be gleaned from one quotation. In interpreting the allegories of the sacred laws Philo writes in respect to, "He shall watch thy head and thou shalt watch his heel" (Gen. 3:15): "This expression is, as to its *language*, a barbarism, but as to the *meaning* which is conveyed by it, a correct expression" (*De Leg. All.* 67).

To him all the numbers used in the Scriptures were significant of spiritual values. This is not to be wondered at when we remember the place they played in Grecian thought from the time of Pythagoras on. In Philo's system number was akin to arrangement. For instance, God made the world in six days, "not because the Creator stood in need of length of time; but because the things created required arrangement; and number is akin to arrangement; and of all numbers six is, by the laws of nature, the most productive. For of all numbers from the unit upward, it is the first perfect one, being made equal to its parts, and being made complete by them; the number three being half of it, and the number two a third of it, and the unit a sixth of it, and, so to say, it is formed so as to be both male and female, and is made up of the power of both natures; for in existing things the odd number is the male, and the even is the female, accordingly of odd numbers the first is the number three, and of even numbers the first is two, and the two numbers multiplied together make six. It is fitting, therefore, that the world, being the most perfect of created things, should be made according to the perfect number, namely, six" (*De Mundi Opif.* 3).

His theory of the inner meaning of proper names is indicated in the following scheme, which he uses throughout all his writings with a rare consistency: Abel is lover of God; Joseph is the diversified pride of life; Ishmael is the sophist, the exponent of wild opinions; Israel is seeing

God; Jacob is virtue acquired by practice; Isaac is self-taught offspring; Cain is wickedness; Enoch is grace; Phanuel is turning away from God; Gideon is retreat from robbers; Aaron is uttered speech; Leah is virtue; Asher is riches; Sara is prudence; Rebecca is patience; Dinah is judgment; Manasseh is forgetfulness; Laban is mind without wisdom; Abraham is virtue derived from instruction, etc.

Names of countries also are interpreted as having some peculiar inner meaning: Egypt stands for passions; Sodom is barren of wisdom; Country is body; Chaldea is opinion; Haran is land of outward sense; Ephraim is memory; Canaan is wickedness; Edom is earthly; Meshek is eternal sense; Amorite is sophist.

Likewise, when animals are spoken of in Holy Writ there is a hidden meaning which only the initiated may know: Horse is restive passion; cattle is irrational nature; ram is speech; goat is external sense; turtle-dove is divine wisdom; pigeon is human wisdom; reptile is soul rooted in the ground; serpent is concupiscence; raven is wickedness; brazen serpent is patient endurance; camel is memory.

Further, the commonplace things of earthly life are fraught with sterling philosophic meaning for those who can read: Charioteer is mind; belly is pleasure; feet is support of pleasure; shoulder is labor; breast is passion; ark is body; cherubim is time—eternity; candlestick is heaven; sword is heaven; house is soul; vine is folly; wine is greediness; Jordan is deceit; heaven is mind; water is passions or mind; river is speech; rod is education; pitcher is teaching; manna is divine word; first fruit is full doctrine; night is folly; day is wisdom; Paradise is wisdom; flame is virtue; sun is mind; rib is virtue; man is mind; woman is outer sense; priest is conviction; high priest is reason.

The above is only a suggestion of the exhaustive and thoroughgoing scheme of this master of allegory. It is readily seen that his task was no insincere one. He not only finds history in the sacred writings, but everywhere there must be an inner meaning. Beneath the surface he reads, as Greeks and Romans had done before him (cf. Cicero *De Nat. Deo.* ii. 26; iii. 24), the interplay of virtues and the subtle but none the less convincing elaboration of true philosophic dogma. By the efficient use of his method he made the Old Testament law, discourse in the accents and syllogisms of contemporary Greek thought. In this he was perhaps the most outstanding apologete of Judaism in all her history. Certainly he perfected the movement among his own people, which had been in course of development for more than six centuries, and which later was adopted by some of the early leaders of the Christian church.

Beyond the appropriation of the language of the more cultured nation and the significant change of front which came about thereby, the Jewish people also adopted many of the general customs of their conquerors, and thus reduced very considerably the chasm between them. Nowhere was the impact of Greece on Palestine felt more strongly than in the social life of the people. The virile Greek overlords were almost unparalleled as propagandists. Simultaneously with the conquest of their arms and the march of their armies they introduced their social customs. Here Hellenism and Hebraism came together in close contact for the first time. The luxurious living, the social freedom, and the riotous pleasures of the shores of the Aegean were now transplanted to the barren hillsides of Judean life. Greek ideals that appealed to the pleasure-loving side of the youth of the land were thus disseminated through media which were all but irresistible.

The stadium, with its physical struggles and the splendid development and achievements of the participants, soon attracted the native populace in and around every Greek city and enlisted the services of many of the youths of the land in its contests (II Macc. 4:13–16). The hippodrome, with its recklessness and wild excitement, drew its motley mass of patrons from every race and from every walk in life (III Macc. 4:11; T. Jos. 20:3). The gymnasium was of perhaps still greater and more far-reaching influence (I Macc. 1:14; II Macc. 4:9–14; IV Macc. 4:20). This was an unmistakable expression of Greek life and thought. In developing the body they were living out their fundamental demand for beauty of form. This presented to the Jewish youth an ambition which was entirely unknown to his forefathers. The strength of that appeal is seen in the fact that many of those whose fathers considered it the greatest stigma to be "uncircumcized," now voluntarily put away the sign of their national religion (II Macc. 4:12–17; 11:24; Jub. 3:31; 7:20; I Macc. 1:15; Assump. Mos. 8:1–3; Jos., *Ant.*, XII, v, 1). In fact, Jewish thought itself became revolutionized. It was only because of such influences as the above that a Jew later could utter as his own the ideals of the Greek, "He that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things" (I Cor. 9:25). But the gymnasium was not merely for the development of the physical. It was a social center. It was a place of companionships, and a stimulant to ambition. Related to it and organized under it were guilds of young men called *epheboi*. The members of the guild wore an attractive uniform, a broad-rimmed hat or cap, high-laced boots, and a *chlamys* fastened around the shoulders with a brooch, and on certain public occasions marched in procession in

all their regalia. The cap (πέτασος) was a sign of subjection to Greek customs (II Macc. 4:12–15; cf. Ath. 537 f.). Certain of the princes of the subject race were admitted into the inner circles of these guilds. Jonathan was admitted to the rank of *Friend*, and also *Kinsman* by Balas (Bevan, *Jerus. u. H. Priest*, 104–6). Thus in a most definite way was the youth drawn into the currents of Greek national life and inoculated with its spirit. Indeed the strong tendency was for secession of the people, particularly the youth, from the cold and barren régime which had been inherited from the early experience of their ancestors, to the more mellow atmosphere of the new culture (III Macc. 2:32; cf. II Macc. 4:12–15). The actual situation is well portrayed in the Twelve Patriarchs: "Ye shall make your daughters singing girls and harlots, and ye shall mingle in the abominations of the Gentiles" (T. Judah 23:2).

While the agora with its public discussions and its intellectual outlook did not immediately affect so wide a circle as did some of the more popular movements, nevertheless, it did infect a few very deeply and essentially with Hellenic ideals. The theater, however, with its unequal merits ranging from the poorest comedies to the works of the great dramatists, was a school which cast its spell on all classes of citizens alike. Thus it was not long before a knowledge of Greek literature seemed to be a *sine qua non* of culture. This is supported by the fact that from this period there has been preserved much Jewish literature in Greek, but very little in the mother tongue.

The influence of architecture was also felt. On every side the form of the Corinthian column and the decorative ornamentation of Greek art was found. Her buildings were erected in all the main cities of the country. The wealthy Jew modeled his residence after the more ornate and more fashionable new structures. In the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, Jason received permission to remodel Jerusalem on Hellenic lines. Later the Herodian temple bore witness to the prevailing type of architecture (Bevan, *Jerus. u. H. Priest*, 79; Jos., *Ant.*, XV, xi, 5).

Government, changing with the growing city life, grew apace. Alexander the Great was a noted city builder, and the new life which was infused throughout Syria set its currents strongly toward city life. Thus the city became the ideal. Only under such an influence could Ben Sirach contemptuously cry: "How can he have wisdom . . . . whose talk is of bullocks?" (Ecclus. 38:25). The very constitution of the Jewish commonwealth could not fail to be radically affected thereby.

The elders (זקנים) seem not only to have been affected in their composition and function, though the exact influence is not definitely known,

but the new situation gave them a new name, γηρουσία. This name is first met in I Maccabees (I Macc. 12:6; cf. LXX II Chron. 19:8). Later we find references to it in other books (Judith 4:8; 11:14; 15:8; II Macc. 1:10; 4:44; 11:28; III Macc. 1:8). The high priest presided over it. It seems to have been constituted by annual election, and thus some changes from the old aristocratic idea were in full swing. So far as it is possible to trace, it seems feasible to think that this is the same body as that which is known better by the later name, again a foreign one, Sanhedrin (Jos., *Ant.*, XIV, ix, 4; cf. Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, I, 111).

The scientific thought of the Greek world no doubt was readily accepted by many of the Jews. Sirach is urgent in his recommendation to cultivate the physician: "It is from God the physician getteth wisdom, ... God hath created medicines out of the earth" (Ecclus. 38:1–5; cf. Bevan, *Jerus. u. H. Priest*, 67). Nor is the author of Wisdom less appreciative of the particular sciences fostered in those days by the Greeks—philosophy, cosmology, chronology, astronomy, zoölogy, and demonology (Wisd. of Sol. 7:17–22; cf. Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, I, 546).

But perhaps there is no single fact that is of greater evidential value for our own discussion than this, that that party which among the Jews had always to be reckoned with, in national and religious affairs, the Sadducees, was the protagonist for Hellenic culture (Schürer, *Hist. Jew. Peop.*, I, 1, 286–87).

But the influence of surrounding custom strikes still deeper. It affects the religious life and religious forms. Feasts went hand in hand with all public functions. Decorations played a part almost entirely foreign to the old and sterner life. The temple itself is enwreathed in garlands on joyous occasions (I Macc. 4:57; II Macc. 10:7; cf. Jud. 15:13; Wisd. of Sol. 2:8). Music adds to the enlivenment of these feasts. Plato had held that music was one of the liberal arts. The spirit of the Greeks is caught up in Ben Sirach (Ecclus. 14:4–6, 10–11, 14–19; 31:28, 31; 32:3–6; 40:20–21; 44:5; 47:9; cf. Twelve Patr., T. Judah 23:2–4). The Jewish temple service may itself have been enriched in its music by a reflection from this life (cf. Ecclus. 50:11–21).

But the Greek feasts were inseparable from the Greek religion. This, like the customs, was all pervasive. Not only was circumcision denied, but the literal interpretation of much of the law was only poorly observed. Flesh of forbidden animals was eaten. Not only was the πέτασος worn (II Macc. 4:12–15), but we find many initiated into

the Greek mysteries (Wisd. of Sol. 8:4) and learn that not only were there novitiates (μύστης), but also those who were full fledged (τέλειος; cf. Hatch, *Greek Infl.*, 283). It is quite possible that the synagogue now arose among the Diaspora as an offset to these paganizing influences (Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 72, 197 f.). The movement toward a spiritual and intellectual observance of the Sabbath, which perhaps dated back earlier than the time of Ezra, would now be accelerated, especially among the Diaspora (Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 199). Perhaps what may be the recognition of the organization of the synagogue has been preserved in the phrase "Congregation of God" (מועדי אל), used in one of the Psalms (Ps. 74:8).

It is thus readily seen that all phases of Hebrew life and activity were saturated to their very depths by the thought of a people whose viewpoint was the antipodes of their own. This new, subtle, and masterful life reacted strongly on them. In part they absorbed it, in part it served to bring out the more clearly their own unique contributions to the world-thought. We are now prepared to consider their direct replies to the various attacks which were launched against them by their conquerors.

II

THE JEWISH ANSWER TO THE VARIOUS ATTACKS

That the name Jew was generally opprobrious is well known. A people so seclusive, and at the same time so intolerant of any worship other than their own, and so insistent in the annunciation of their own faith, would of necessity be strongly opposed and greatly hated by the nations among whom they lived. During their contact with the Greeks their experience was no more favorable than it had been among other nations. In various ways, directly and indirectly, the Jew through three centuries presented his apologetic to the criticisms which were hurled against him and his religion (cf. Krüger, *Hellenismus u. Judentum im. N.T. Zeitalter*, 31–82). The charges and the answers thereto may be ordered under two heads: first, those relating to the nation; second, those which deal more specifically with their religion.

THE ATTACKS ON THE NATION

A glorious antiquity was considered to be the passport into the charmed circle of the Greek intellectual aristocracy. No boast has been more common among people of all races than that of distinguished and ancient lineage. Early Egypt boasted of an ancestry which was lost in the haze of far distant millennia. Babylonia, likewise, gloried in a past which was lost in antiquity. The charge of a brief and insignificant genealogical record is one which the apologists took the greatest care to remove. Fragments from Demetrius, who lived about 200 B.C., Eupolemus, and Artapanus, who came a little later, go to show that there were Jewish writers who were confident of the antiquity and the glory of their race (Euseb., *Praep. evang.*, IX, 1–3; XXI, 18; Clement, *Str.*, I, 23, 153).

Apollonius of Molon carefully constructed a chronology showing the antiquity of his people. Josephus is, however, the chief advocate of the ancient glory of his nation against the current attacks. Though beyond the scope of our task, the contribution of Josephus, though often not so accurate as we might wish, is so direct and emphatic that we may here take it as the organization of tendencies of which only remnants have been preserved to us outside of his work. He arranged his books after the order of Greek historians, and, influenced further by them, he

gave as a title to his first work, "Twenty Books of Judean Archaeology." His claim is clearly outlined in *Contra Apion:* "Our Jewish nation is of very great antiquity and had a distinct subsistence of its own originally" (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 1). His purpose was to provide a more just opinion of his nation. If they were not well known, it was because of their inland situation, and their quiet type of life. Further, their conduct of life was peculiar to themselves, and thus they were not mentioned frequently by historians. Yet, he contends, the fact remains that they were known by the outside nations. From the testimony of Manetho he quotes: "The forefathers of the Jews were delivered out of Egypt 393 years before Danus, upon whom the Argives look as their most ancient King, came to Argos" (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 16). Thus he deduces the fact that the Jews were delivered from Egypt almost one thousand years before the siege of Troy (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 14–16). Similarly he makes use of Syrian records, and shows that the splendid temple of Solomon was built 143 years before the Syrians founded Carthage (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 17). Menander the Ephesian is quoted to corroborate the same fact (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 18). Josephus seems to have done a thorough piece of research work in history, for he gives us a list of some eighteen writers who bear witness to the antiquity of the Jews. Later Philo meets in the same way similar and other attacks in his pamphlet, *Quod Deus sit immutabilis.*

There was, however, to be met no more persistent attack against the Jews than that they were a leprous slave people who lacked all semblance of culture. Manetho, the Egyptian priest, (*circa* 250 B.C.) seems to have been the first chronicler of the tradition that the Jews were a nation of slaves, who were leprous and impure, and that thus they were driven out of Egypt and sold to the mines east of the Nile (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 14–16, 26–27). Lysimachus of the first century B.C. repeats the story in part, making to it a new contribution. Not only were they leprous and scabby, but they obtained their food by begging, and under the leadership of Moses they were regardless of proprieties, and delighted to overturn altars. Because of such actions, by the command of Bochoris they were all drowned (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 34–35; II, 2, 14). Chaeremon, another Egyptian priest, who was also a Stoic philosopher, repeated in general the story of Manetho (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 32–33). Then Apion, a contemporary of Josephus, in his work Αἰγυπτιακά, repeats the slanders of the earlier historians (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 1–3). The same attitude is preserved by all the Greek historians, who in their writings treat at all of the Jewish people (Schürer, *Hist. Jew. Peop.*, II, 3, 261 ff.). Even Tacitus in his writings gives a similar account of Jewish history (*Hist.* v. 22 ff.).

Indirect replies to such an attitude as that represented in the above were many. The early days and the great names of the nations past were glorified in much of the current literature. The Israelitish individual or nation is held up as an illustrious example of right conduct and heroic action, or as the recipient of astonishing divine favors in such books as Tobit, Sibylline Oracles, Jubilees, Patriarchs, Daniel, Esther, Maccabees, the lost work of Jason of Cyrene, Judith, and Josephus. In many of these, as will be seen later, the characteristic which is idealized is Grecian rather than Jewish. All these writers show the nation as possessing the same high-born culture as other nations. Their leaders in great achievement and in breadth of intellectual outlook were in the van of the world's great leaders. Frequently the immorality and grossness of the Patriarchs were omitted in the rewriting of history (cf. Twelve Patriarchs). Always the picture was gilded and frequently the telling touches were borrowed from Greek ideals. This literature had not only as its object the comfort of the Hebrews, but it also sought to inspire a respect for the Jewish people and their religion, and it thus forms a very substantial background for the more direct polemic.

An anonymous writer, from whom a fragment has been preserved in Eusebius, traces the genealogy of Abraham back to the giants, asserts that he taught the Phoenicians concerning the sun and the moon, and then, going to Egypt, taught the priests of Heliopolis in matters of astrology and other learning (*Praep. evang.*, IX, 17–18). The father of the faithful thus was made to stand out as the man of greatest culture in the early days. Kleodomus, whom Polyhistor accredits with writing a history, gives him yet greater glory, and links him up with current Greek legends (Jos., *Ant.*, I, xv). John Hyrcanus is reported to have written a history of his people along much the same lines. Polyhistor refers also to the apologetic of the same type by Aristeas, Theodotus, Molon, and Ezekiel. These have been preserved to us in part by Eusebius (*Praep. evang.*, IX, 17–39). Artapanus adopts a rather novel method to prove his case. He presents and supports the theory that Moses of the Jews is none other than the Greek Musaeus and the Egyptian Hermes. He surrounds the traditional lawgiver with many of the accessories of Egyptian legend, and thus endeavors to win for the founder of his nation a favorable consideration from the gentile world (Euseb., *Praep. evang.*, IX, 27). Aristobulus asserts that Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato derived their doctrines from Moses, in fact, the peripatetic philosophy was dependent on him (Euseb., *Praep. evang.*, XIII, 12, 1; Clement, *Str.*, V, 14, 97). The pseudepigraphists exalt a number of their

great historical characters, as Daniel, Solomon, Jeremiah, Josiah, Baruch, to the pinnacle of human perfection.

Josephus here again proves to be the systematic defender of his people. As already indicated, his history from the indirect standpoint was a most telling apologetic. The prowess and the virtue of his ancestry were here celebrated. The men of the past and their deeds were idealized. With the passing of the centuries and their accumulating traditions, under the glowing patriotism of the historian, the human weaknesses of the actors were forgotten, their heroism stood out more prominently, statistics representing national strength were increased by thousands, late conceptions were represented as having obtained from the beginning, and the whole history of the people, as it was rewritten, was intended to impress the mind of the gentile reader. But Josephus put all his strength into a direct defense against various definite accusations. He cited the then well-known facts, that in recent years the Jews had been considered worthy of special favors at the hands of their rulers. Alexander the Great had given them possession of their own country, and had bestowed on them the same freedoms and immunities as on the Macedonians themselves. The Jews in the various cities in which they lived were permitted, by special statute, to be called by the name of that city, as Alexandrians, Ephesians, etc. Quoting from Hecataeus, he shows that "Alexander honored the Jews to such a degree, that, for the equity and fidelity, which they gave proof of, he permitted them to hold the country of Samaria free from tribute." Ptolemy Lagus was so confident of their loyalty and valor that he intrusted to their care the fortresses of Egypt and colonized Cyrene and other cities of Lybia with these people. Ptolemy Philadelphus not only freed the nation, but removed certain duties from them, and further was so convinced as to the value of their Scriptures as to require a translation of them. Ptolemy Euergetes showed his belief in the power of the God of the Jews by sacrificing in Jerusalem according to their laws on the occasion of his victory over all Syria. Philometer and Cleopatra so recognized their efficiency as to give the whole charge of the government to Onias and Doritheus, who were both Jews. These men saved the Egyptian nation from the hands of revolters. Later, when Ptolemy Physcon planned to destroy many Jews of Alexandria by a band of elephants, the divine approval of the oppressed people was manifested when the enraged beasts wreaked vengeance on the servants of the tyrant. Last of all, Julius Caesar, in his epistles, bore testimony to the virtue of the Jewish nation (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 4–5).

Beyond this, however, Josephus moves back into history and asserts the greatness of certain individuals of his nation. That among his own people there should be men of culture he held was most natural. As a race they were not given to war or robbery. They were not a maritime people, so their attention was taken up with their home affairs. The education of their children was thus their chief care, and they thought the true business of life was the observance of the rules of piety (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 12).

The outside world had learned much from his ancestors. The philosophy of Diogenes had been borrowed from the Jews (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 22). It had been stated by Hermippus that Pythagoras had imitated the Jewish doctrines and had incorporated many of their laws in his philosophy (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 22). Tyre also, it was stated by Theophrastus, had laws such as prohibition against swearing foreign oaths, etc., which were found only among the Jews and hence borrowed (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 22). The work and significance of Moses, which had been attacked by Apollonius of Molon, Lysimachus, and Apion, was stoutly defended by Josephus. He was the most ancient of all lawgivers, and at the same time his laws were the best. He claimed that the earliest Grecian philosophers had followed the Jewish legislator. Plato had imitated Moses chiefly in this point that everyone should learn the laws accurately. In fact, even "as God himself pervades all the world, so hath our law passed throughout all the world also" (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 13, 15, 37, 40). He seeks to prove from Dius the Phoenician historian that Solomon was wiser than Hiram of Tyre (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 17). In order to refute the strictures of the enemies of his nation, he not only deals in assertions and quotes various historians, but by pitting one accusation against another he reduces the whole to a *reductio ad absurdum* (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 28–31). Only one instance of this is required to show the method of his argument, viz., inasmuch as Moses introduced a very strict law concerning leprosy and its treatment, these people could not be a nation of lepers. The whole tendency in the treatise *Contra Apion* is to show that the Jewish nation either originated or laid special emphasis on those things which were generally considered to be Greek. In many ways the same spirit is seen, though it is not so systematically set forth, in the writings of Philo. Thus in the interbiblical period there was a great deal of Jewish literature which was written for gentile eyes, having the express purpose of raising the nation of the authors in the general esteem of the pagan world.

The challenge of the opponents of Judaism went even deeper than that of the lack of culture. They branded them as "fellow-haters"

(ἀμιξία, Jos., *Cont. Ap.*, II, 11, 29, 37). In that age of cosmopolitanism such a fault was a crime. Under the influence of Stoicism, the dominant note of the cultured community was social and philanthropic (Zeller, *Stoics*, 295–96). Along with this went the kindred charge that they were thoroughly bad citizens and not infrequently proved disloyal to their lords. They were accused of taking an oath "to bear no good will to any foreigners, and particularly to none of the Greeks" (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 11). It was considered conclusive that inasmuch as they did not worship the same gods as the Alexandrians, they were therefore the authors of sedition (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 6). Because the Jews would not worship the king they were constantly pilloried by the Gentiles.

It was necessary for the apologists to admit that their nation was somewhat exclusive. Josephus maintained, however, that, on the one hand, this was the common practice of all nations (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 37). On the other hand, he asserted that the lawgiver of Israel "does not show any envious mind toward those who cultivate a friendship with us" (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 29). It was ordained that even enemies should be treated with moderation (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 30), and that those who desired to partake of Jewish institutions should be freely admitted thereto (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 37). On the whole, it is concluded that the Jew had not been narrower in his sympathies than those of other nations. Beyond this, these people had been found possessing that most excellent quality of faithfulness to their own laws, in a degree not surpassed by any other nation. Not only are their observance of specific laws, as those pertaining to the Sabbath, images, foods, etc., referred to in much of their literature, as Tobit, Daniel, Esther, II Maccabees, Judith, etc., but Josephus concludes the whole matter by such a sweeping declaration as: "No one can tell of more than one or two that have betrayed our laws, even on fear of death" (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 38; I, 22; II, 31; Jos., *Ant.*, XVI, ii, 4; XVI, vi, 2).

These writers are at considerable pains to establish their loyalty. The above-mentioned favors granted by kings are appealed to. The various good offices of the Jews are recited. The sacrifice offered in Jerusalem for the monarch is emphasized (cf. I Macc. 7:33; II Macc. 3:32; Ezra 6:10). Their peculiar religious conceptions which opposed idolatry are elaborated as reasons why they should not follow in the easy ways of human worship of other nations. All sides of the question are met and answered especially by Josephus (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 6–38).

THE ATTACKS ON THEIR RELIGION

The religious ideas and attitude of the Hebrews are, however, equally a point of attack by the Hellenists. The ritual is both grossly misunderstood and scathingly censured. Food laws presented an excellent target for the critics. Abhorrence of swine's flesh was one of the distinguishing characteristics of the true Jew. Antiochus Epiphanes did his best to override the prejudices of the people in this respect (I Macc. 1:47; 2:16). The same attitude of opposition on the part of the Greeks to this taboo is found down to the end of our period (Jos., *Jew. Wars*, VII, 81; *Cont. Ap.*, II, 14).

Circumcision likewise meets with the derision of the more cultured nation (Jos., *Cont. Ap.*, II, 13; Horace *Sat.* i. 9. 69; Juvenal *Sat.* xiv. 105–6; Tac. *Hist.* v. 4). The attitude of the young Jew to this sign of his race indicates how strong the feeling had grown.

The Sabbath was another of their distinctive regulations which met with general ridicule on the part of their enemies. On more than one occasion their reverence for the letter of the law cost them the lives of many of their fellows (cf. I Macc. 2:34; 9:34; Jos., *Ant.*, XIV, iv, 3; II Macc. 5:24, 25; 6:6; 8:26; 12:38). No more scandalous attack was made against this religious function than that in which Apion attempts to explain the origin of the observance. He relates it to Sabbatosis, which he asserts was the name of the Egyptian remedy for the buboes in the groin, from which the Jews suffered after six days' traveling from Egypt (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 2).

There were, however, some very wild misrepresentations of their ritual afloat through the country. Two of the most notorious were the following. Apion transmitted the story of earlier traditionalists that in the holy place of the Jews, there was a golden head of an ass, of immense value, and that they worshiped this head as deity. The other most unfounded criticism is also chronicled most fully by Apion. The story is as follows: "Antiochus found, upon entering the temple, a man lying upon a bed, with a table before him, set out in all the delicacies that either sea or land could afford. . . . . The King bade him speak freely. . . . . The man then burst into tears and proceeded to answer: I am a Greek . . . . and was taken up by some foreigners, brought to this place, and shut up with positive orders not to suffer mortal to approach me. . . . . They gave me to understand that the Jews had a custom among them, once a year, upon a certain day prefixed, to seize upon a Grecian stranger and, when they had kept him

fattening one whole year, to take him into a wood, and offer him up as a sacrifice, according to their own form, taking a taste of his blood, with a horrid oath to live and die sworn enemies to the Greeks" (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 8).

To these accusations two lines of defense were instituted: The one was that many of these calumnies were preposterous on the face of them. None of the proselytes from other nations were aware of these atrocities, and they were contrary to the whole genius of the Jewish religion (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 9–11). The other method of meeting the situation was a defense of the validity of such restrictions. The Egyptian priests were quoted as both abstaining from swine's food and practicing circumcision (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 14). An early writer had drawn sufficiently on his imagination to assure his readers that though the heathen scoffed at the rite of circumcision, the very angels themselves had been so created (Jub. 15:26, 27, 14). A similar apologetic is made by the same writer for the observance of the Sabbath (Jub. 2:18–19, 2, 31). Other nations, likewise, it was held by Josephus, had their exclusive regulations, and, on the whole, the constancy of the Jew to the laws of his fathers was commendatory (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 8, 22; II, 38).

Aristobulus was a thoroughgoing Pythagorean when he explained the origin of the Sabbath, not from the idea that God rested—the Divine Being never needed rest—but from the consideration that this was doing honor to the number 7 (Zeller, *Die. Gr.*, III, 2, 264).

The charge of atheism is also laid at their door (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 22, 36). This was in large measure due to the fact that they did not worship the gods of other nations, nor give to men that homage which was due to God only, nor would they bow down before images. Their most acceptable apologetic was the able statement of monotheism made by Josephus in *Cont. Ap.*, II. 16, 23; cf. Aristeas 16.

The attack upon their worship was fundamentally an attack on their Scriptures. Josephus, here again, makes the earliest formal defense of their Scriptures. To prove the veracity of the Jewish Scriptures in matters of history, he calls to his aid the testimony of many of the world-historians: Manetho, Menander, Berosus, Megasthenes, Philostratus, Dius the Phoenician, *et al.* (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 14–21). After various proofs he concludes that the records of the Jews are of all the most accurate. They carry down the story of the world from the creation to his own time, and are free from any disagreement (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 6–8). Priests had been appointed for the purpose of making and preserving the records from the beginning. This duty, because

of the great care of the system and the high character of the priests, had been performed most adequately (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 7). The character of the Scripture had, on the one hand, been attested by the fact that many Jews would rather lose their lives than violate a single word (*Cont. Ap.*, I, 8, 22). On the other hand, the fact that the proselytes were not few (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 1, 11), and that even a Greek king had worshiped in Jerusalem in accordance with the rites of the temple (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 5; cf. Aristeas 16, 19, 37; III Macc. 3:21; 5:31; 6:24–26; 7:6–8) was good evidence that they were not less worthy than the scriptures of other peoples. The somewhat confident conclusion to the whole matter is that the laws of the Jew were the best in all history as well as the most ancient. In them there was nothing which could be changed for the better; in fact the law continues immortal (*Cont. Ap.*, II, 18, 22–23, 39).

Apart from the theoretical answers which were given to the opponents of Judaism, there was a movement which was a most practical apologetic. The intense loyalty of numbers of the Jews to their religion, together with its spiritual monotheism, laid a basis for a strong appeal to the Greeks. The synagogues throughout the land were centers of religious fires which must have been felt by the Gentiles. Though we have no way of ascertaining the strength of the movement or the number of converts, we have good evidence that a proselytizing propaganda of considerable moment was carried on in the closing centuries of Jewish national life (Wisd. of Sol. 1:1; 6:1–9, 21; Jos., *Cont. Ap.*, II, 10, 39; Jos., *Jew. Wars*, II, xx, 2). No doubt there was a substantial historical background for the words, "They compassed sea and land to make one proselyte" (Matt. 23:15). This gives all the more point to such attacks as that of Apion and also suggests apologetic and propagandist tendencies in much of the literature of this period (cf. Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 88–99).

The duty now remains to pass from the indirect and negative attitude of the apologetic to the more positive note. The way for this was admirably prepared by the close contact of the two peoples for a couple of centuries with the resultant absorption of the thought atmosphere of the Greeks by the Jews. Slowly the way had been prepared for Hebrew thought to be cast in Hellenic mold. With this the following section will deal.

III

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

THE HEBREW THOUGHT RESTATED IN TERMS OF GRECIAN PHILOSOPHY

In the literature of this period we are faced by a readjustment to the current movements of the day in four different though correlated fields of thought: cosmology, psychology, ethics, and theology. In each division we shall endeavor to state briefly the orthodox Jewish belief and the significant features of the Greek philosophies, and then attempt to show how one gradually in part or in whole passed over into the other.

A. COSMOLOGY

That there was a broad chasm separating the old Hebrew cosmogony from the Greek world-thought is easily recognized. The Greek cosmogonies themselves were the result of growth. Significant among the early Greek philosophies stands the Pythagorean movement. To this school, number was not only the governing principle, but was itself the essence of the cosmogony. Other schools endeavored to explain the universe from a single principle, and that, to our conception, a material one. In this material substance Heraclitus found the warring of opposites, which was the explanation of all phenomena. His system, in spite of the fact that he considers the Logos or the cosmical reason to be identical with universal law, is nevertheless a refined pantheistic materialism. Empedocles seems to have been the first who traced the creation of the world to the operation of a non-material agency. Anaxagoras, a contemporary, followed up this conception by maintaining that νοῦς or "Reason" was the cause of the first movement by which the world was formed. Here, mind and matter are conceived as over against each other. To him νοῦς was a spiritual and not a material substance. Thus the foundation for dualism was firmly laid. Plato, however, in his own way, brought this opposition more clearly to light. To him the first cause was purely spiritual. He further recognized the difficulty of the purely spiritual acting on the purely material. He considered that this could be accomplished in part only. The material had a certain resisting quality named necessity (ἀνάγκη), which the spiritual was unable completely to overcome and which was the root of evil. Thus the spiritual in its creative activity introduced

into the material only "as many proportions as it was possible for it to receive" (*Tim.* 69B). The corollary of this is his world of ideas. In it there are two divisions, which are designated the body and the soul. The body, which was composed of the four elements, was controlled by mathematical forms and numbers (*Tim.* 53B). The soul was highly metaphysical, possessing the attributes of motion and intelligence. This universe, body and soul together, the archetypal world, was "the image of the Creator, the only begotten" (*Tim.* 92C), and it governed the natural and the known world. The cosmical soul (νοῦς or λόγος), was the nexus between these two worlds. This relation between the two and the method of maintaining that relation is nowhere worked out completely. We have, however, in this the systematic attempt to explain the world on a dualistic principle. Later the neo-Platonists contended that the ultimate source of being was a real unity which transcended both matter and spirit.

The Stoics who carried forward the germinal ideas of earlier teachers exercised considerable influence on Hebrew thought from another viewpoint. To them the primary substance, called spirit (πνεῦμα) or air (αἰθήρ), was matter and force in one. The mode of creative activity was inward pressure. Under this principle, called by them the seminal logos, which was none other than God himself, they held that there was an upward movement toward the lighter and more active substance which becomes force, and a downward movement toward the more solid substance which becomes more and more passive and most truly matter. The universe thus was a rational evolution, of which process man was the highest expression. Explaining the universe as they did from the material principle, they were materialistic pantheists.

The Hebrew people, on the other hand, were never interested in cosmogony *per se*. It was only as the God-idea affected it that it received any consideration at their hands. As a rule, they accepted without question the general conceptions of their neighbors and kinsmen. In their earliest writings their statements are very incomplete and somewhat naïve. To them things were as they seemed. The general Semitic idea of a flat earth, with waters above and waters below, was accepted. Creation had been by a divine fiat from a God outside of the world, which, once formed, remained static.

Later in the Old Testament there seem to be advance movements. In the P creation story (Gen. 1:1–2, 4*a*) much attention, after the manner of this school, is given to the orderly progress in the work of creation. It is fitted into a perfect number scheme and man is the culmination of

the whole process. While in this story the conflict between God (אלהים) and the void (תהום) is preserved by only the most tenuous suggestions, there is nothing which denies the dualism which underlay the Babylonian mythology. In view of what Semitic cosmogony was and the part which astral worship played, "The greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night" (Gen. 1:16), might easily have become the basis for a type of dualism. A contemporary perhaps of P, who has presented the most far-reaching view of monotheism in the Old Testament, may have met this, or if not this then a similar danger, in this memorable phrase, "I form light and create darkness" (Isa. 45:7).

Prov. 8:22–31 (cf. 3:19–20) is a product of the idea of the transcendence of God which reached its most adequate expression in Deutero-Isaiah. Not only is it more poetic than the first chapter of Genesis, but the conception of wisdom (חכמה) being with God from the beginning, before the creation of the cosmos, as a master-workman or nurseling (אמון), is a decided step toward cosmological ideas which were prevalent in the Greek World.[1] That the writer of this section of the Book of Proverbs was directly influenced by outside thought movements it is not possible to assert with certainty. With the development of the idea of the transcendence and the spirituality of Deity, the Hebrews themselves, though not given much to philosophic thought, must have felt the need of some intermediary between God and the world. In the canonical books we have one other glimpse where beings of divine or semi-divine origin are represented as present at and sympathetic with the work of creation (Job 38:4–7). Apart from these few evidences—and even these may have been influenced by Greece—we have no further indications of cosmological ideas of the Hebrews which would correspond to the general outlook of the Greek world.

As the intellectual interest of the Jews was only incidentally turned toward cosmological problems, the Grecian influence here may briefly be summed up. No doubt the comprehensiveness of the Greek viewpoint contributed to make the Jewish statement of the universe more orderly and systematic than it had hitherto been. Under this interest, apparently, the story of the creation is thoroughly elaborated in the Secrets of Enoch (En., chaps. 25–30). While the coloring of the conceptions of heaven is largely influenced by Persia, the need of these days resulted in many systematic attempts clearly to present the hypothetical future world for the encouragement of the present sufferers.

[1] While "master-workman" is the translation favored in general by the older lexicographers and commentators, with a good deal of justification Gunkel (*Schöpf. u. Chaos*, 94), Toy (*I.C.C., in loc.*), Buhl (Lexicon), and others translate it "nurseling."

Well-ordered presentations of the future world are found in Enoch (En., chap. 22), the Twelve Patriarchs (T. Levi 2:7—3:10), the Book of Jubilees (Jub. 4:21; 32:21–25), the Ascension of Isaiah (Asc. Isa., chaps. 7–10), and the Secrets of Enoch (Slav. En., chaps. 3–22). Hades is arranged in four divisions, and each division is peopled under the principle of moral distinctions (En., chap. 22). Similarly there are provisions made for orderly grading in the seven heavens (Slav. En., chaps. 7–17).

To express the idea of a well-ordered whole, we find more than one of their writers using certain time-honored philosophical expressions of the Greeks. Kosmos (*κόσμος*, used for "world" first by Pythagoras; cf. Hatch, *Greek Infl.*, 209) and the words from the same root have found their way into the LXX (Dt. 4:19; 17:3; Isa. 24:21; 40:26, *et al.*). Here it is used for the Hebrew צבא, and may only very indirectly reflect the Greek idea of harmony and unity. In the Prayer of Manasseh we find the word again with perhaps no deeper significance (*σὺν πάντι τῷ κοσμῷ αὐτῶν*, Prayer of Man., vs. 2). The Wisdom of Solomon uses it in a comprehensive sense: "for the world is a fighter on behalf of the righteous" (*ὑπέρμαχος γὰρ ὅ κόσμος ἐστὶ δικαίων*, Wisd. of Sol. 16:17; cf. 7:17). Likewise *διοικεῖ*, which was a common expression on the lips of the Stoics for the correct ordering of the world (e.g., Chrysippus in Plutarch, *Plac. Phil.* i. 28; Diogenes, *Laert.* vii. 133; Epictet., *Diss.* III, 15, 14; and frequently in Philo and Josephus), is regularly used in the Wisdom of Solomon to express the same idea. The emphasis on the orderly arrangement of the whole is clearly expressed in "And sweetly doth she order all things" (*καὶ διοικεῖ τὰ πάντα χρηστῶς*, Wisd. of Sol. 8:1). The same is true of "And orderest us with great favor" (*καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς φειδοῦς διοικεῖς ἡμᾶς*, Wisd. of Sol. 12:18; cf. 15:1). Pythagorean and Stoic terminology mingle in "But she hath ordered all things in measure and number and weight" (*ἀλλὰ πάντα μέτρῳ καὶ ἀριθμῷ καὶ σταθμῷ διέταξας*, Wisd. of Sol. 11:20; cf. Twelve Patr. T. Naph. 2:3; En. 43:2). Again, we find two very common philosophic terms to describe the process of creation, "She passeth through and goeth through all things by reason of her pureness" (*διήκει δὲ καὶ χωρεῖ διὰ πάντων διὰ τὴν καθαρότητα*, Wisd. of Sol. 7:24; cf. Plutarch, *Plac. Phil.* i. 8, 17).

An interesting piece of apologetic, which is at least indirectly related to the Hebrew cosmogony, is the book of "celestial physics" in Enoch (chaps. 72–82). The aim of the writer seems to have been to prove the validity of the Jewish calendar, particularly in opposition to that of

the Greeks. He asserts that the moon is the infallible divider of time, bringing "in all the years exactly, so that their position is not prematurely advanced or delayed by a single day unto eternity" (En. 74:12).[1] His lunar year of three hundred and sixty-four days (7×52) he makes agree with the solar year by the insertion of intercalary days in the third, fifth, and eighth years (En. 74:13–16). He gives us reason to believe that not only had he before him the eight-year cycle of the Greek calendar, but that his special point of attack was the calendar of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days which was then in vogue (En. 74:13–17; cf. Slav. En. 68:1–3). He contended that the Greek calendar of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days caused much confusion because, by the very necessity of the case, feast days yearly changed from one day of the week to another (En. 82:5–9). While the system presented was less perfect than those which were opposed, being built up on the phases of the moon, it was essentially Jewish. However, in his effort to win the day for a phase of thought which was Semitic, he used as his instruments of defense a semi-scientific elaboration of the methods and principles of the Pythagoreans. The opposite side of this contention is taken up by the author of Jubilees. He overrides the lunar month and accepts that of the Greeks, viz., thirty days, and the solar year of twelve months, adding a number of intercalary days to make the year $365\frac{1}{4}$ days (cf. Jub. 4:17; 5:27; 6:29–30; 12:16, 27; 16:11–13; 25:16). The fact that one who was a polemicist for Judaism should thus defend and appropriate a Greek institution shows how completely Greek influence was permeating Jewish thinking.

That under the tutelage of the Greeks some of the Hebrews came to the conclusion that in the creation of the world the Creator acted upon matter which was a passive substance is quite apparent. It is true that the more Jewish idea of creation out of nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων) is emphasized by the authors of II Maccabees and the Apocalypse of Baruch (II Macc. 7:28; Apoc. Bar. 21:4; 48:8). But, on the other hand, the author of the Wisdom of Solomon uses the most significant phrases of the dualists. He holds that the world (κόσμος) was made from formless matter (ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης, Wisd. of Sol. 11:17). Both of these words are used in a technical sense by the Platonists (Diog. *Laert.* iii. 41; vii. 134; Plato, *Tim.* 51A; cf. Wace, *Comm., in loc.*). In

[1] Charles by a change of text for which there is some evidence, both textual and contextual, makes Enoch attribute the above result, viz., the exact division of time, to the sun rather than the moon (Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, II, 240). If this represents the original reading, it leaves Enoch in entire agreement with the author of Jubilees and makes him more of a Greek than he otherwise would be.

use ὕλη and νοῦς were the antitheses of each other. "Elements" (στοιχεῖον) is used in a Greek sense in Wisdom (Wisd. of Sol. 7:17; 19:18). In Slavonic Enoch, man is made by divine wisdom out of seven substances (Slav. En. 30:8). In the same book we have a picturesque representation of the world being formed out of pre-existent material (Slav. En. 25:1–2). It is possible that Slav. En. 24:2, which as it stands seems to contradict this, may be textually faulty (cf. Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, II, 444). These few unordered expressions are signs of that movement toward the Greek conception of matter which was perfected in Philo.

When transcendence is so intensified as to make dualism a logical necessity, the question of the medium of creation becomes a vital issue. In late Hebrew thought the need was felt. Contact with Greece facilitated interpretation. Wisdom (חכמה) now became σοφία, νοῦς, or λόγος. While it is true that God is spoken of as the all (τὸ πὰν ἔστιν αὐτός, Ecclus. 43:27; cf. 11:14; 16:26; 18:1–14; 36:5, *et al.*), yet σοφία is the creative principle which is poured out from the mouth of Yahweh on all the earth (Ecclus. 1:4–9). The Book of Jubilees, though an attack on Hellenism, is so far unconsciously influenced by its environment as to assign the various natural phenomena to the charge of angels (Jub. 2:2; cf. En. 60:12–21). The author of Wisdom was undoubtedly a convert to the age. Σοφία was the medium by which God made the world (Wisd. of Sol. 7:22–25; 8:1, 5; 10:17; cf. 9:9). She was the master-workman (τεχνίτης, 13:1) and was with the Almighty before he made the world. She was an unmingled emanation from the glory of the Almighty. This descriptive phrase (ἀπόῤῥοια . . . . εἰ λικρινής, 7:24) was one which in the Greek world did duty in cosmological theories. Athenagoras uses both terms for a similar purpose (*Apol.* 10). It corresponds to the Stoic idea of the human soul being the out-pouring of the divine world-soul. The way in which σοφία is spoken of in Wisdom (Wisd. of Sol. 8:1; 7:22–27; cf. IV Macc. 6:35) shows us that not only were the phrases of the Stoics the common property of the writer, but the λόγος of the Greeks as a creative principle had gained an advocate at court among the Hebrew people.

The archetypal ideas of Plato may have left a slight trace in one or two of our books (Dähne, *Gesch. Darst. der jud.-alex. relig. Phil.*, II, 15–16, does full justice to the evidence). In the Wisdom of Solomon, is the command to build a temple on the holy mount in resemblance (μίμημα) of the holy temple which was prepared from the beginning (Wisd. of Sol. 9:8; cf. LXX Ex. 25:4, 9, and Charles, *Apoc. and*

Pseud., I, 550). In the same book it is said that in the long garment of the priest was the whole world (ὅλος ὁ κόσμος, Wisd. of Sol. 18:24). Whether this was purposely used as a symbol or not, the same figure is taken up both by Philo (*De Mon.* II, 5; *Vita Mos.* III, 14; *De Prop.* 20; *De Migt. Abr.* 18) and by Josephus (*Ant.*, II, vii, 8) as of symbolic significance referring to the whole universe.

In Slavonic Enoch there are many statements which show an appropriation of the same current thought. Time and time again the author refers to the visible and the invisible things (Slav. En. 24:4; 25:1; 47:4, 5; 51:5; 64:5; 65:1, 6; cf. LXX Gen. 1:2). In 25:1, "I commanded in the depths that visible things should come out of the invisible things," there seems to be a decided leaning toward archetypal ideas. Likewise, "For before anything which is visible existed, I alone held my course among the invisible things" (Slav. En. 24:4). Even more definite is, "Before that anything existed and all creatures were made, the Lord made all things both visible and invisible" (Slav. En. 65:1).

From what we have seen above we should judge that while the Hebrews were rarely particularly interested in cosmological speculation, yet they borrowed sufficient of the culture of the Greeks to make it possible to gain their attention for weightier doctrines. Not only did some of them freely and technically use Greek philosophical terms, but they borrowed their ideas. A carefully and harmoniously ordered universe, passivity of matter, and creation by subordinate beings, archetypal ideas, are among the most outstanding cosmological readjustments made by those who were leaders of Jewish thought. These were all carried to their full expression by their chief Hellenist, Philo.

B. PSYCHOLOGY

The Evaluation of Human Personality

It is convenient for us to analyze this side of our question under the following heads: the nature of man, the idea of conscience, the problem of freedom, and the conception of immortality. These problems, which to us are psychological, were by the ancients construed in a metaphysical sense.

Treating first the nature of man, it is necessary for us to turn our attention to the Greek and Hebrew ideas respectively. In the early popular Greek conceptions which have been preserved in Homer (*Odyssey* x–xi) the soul (ψυχή) had an existence in the body (σῶμα), yet independent therefrom, and it was the only part which survived after death. Yet in Hades its existence was rather colorless. The Dionysian cult in

Thrace had a well-defined dualism, though it believed that the soul could not exist apart from a body. One of the earliest attempts of the Greeks to explain the nature of man from a philosophic standpoint is that of Heraclitus. He conceived the soul of man to be an exhalation of fire, which developed out of the moist constituents of the world, and that it was identical with the Logos. It was thus only the finer part of the material substance of the universe, but herein is the beginning of the philosophic dualism of body and soul. This is completed by Anaxagoras. To him νοῦς was a spiritual not a material substance, and it alone was simple, pure, and unmixed. He further identifies νοῦς with ψυχή. Socrates asserts that the soul is part of the universal mind, and Plato describes human souls, which were compounded by the Creator himself, as being thrust down into bodies, which corresponded in perfection to the degree of their fidelity to their higher nature. These souls were both pre-existent and immortal. The Stoics, in complete accord with their pantheistic view, considered that there were souls in all vegetation and also in the lower animals. Only in man, however, did this soul become rational. It was divided up into eight parts, viz., the five senses, speech, reproduction, and the sovereign principle. Through life's experiences the λόγος was evolved in the individual by impressions which were transmitted through the senses to the sovereign principle of the soul. Thereby the human soul came into touch with the universal λόγος. Thus we have a dualism of body and soul, the soul, pre-existent and immortal as it is, linked up with the soul of the universe; the body, material, hence mortal (cf. Adams, *Relig. Teachers of Greece*, 131). The soul on the one side was linked up with the soul of the universe, on the other side it made its impression upon man through his reason (νοῦς) which was human (Adams, *Relig. Teachers of Greece*, 131). Thus their psychology inevitably led them to trichotomy.

The Hebrew conception may now be briefly summarized. In general there is no clear distinction between soul and body in the Old Testament. The writers seem to have in mind the man as a unit, and personality is not analyzed. Various words, such as נפשׁ, בשׂר ודם, בשׂר, רוח, נשׁמה, לבב, are used in a quite inclusive and non-technical sense. It is true that body and soul are sometimes placed over against each other (Dan 7:15; Job 4:19; 14:22; Ps. 16:9; 63:2–10); also that we have in Gen. 2:4—3:1 a possible foundation for trichotomy, but on the whole these speculations were of little interest to the Hebrew. One significant passage occurs in which the spirit (הרוח) is spoken of as a vital spark which comes from and returns to God (Eccles. 12:7). Here there seems

to be a complete differentiation between body and spirit which agrees with and may have been due to Grecian influence.

In the Jewish literature of the interbiblical period we are constantly faced by a dualistic anthropology which was Platonic rather than Jewish. The body and the soul are clearly set over against each other in all the books which at all touch on the subject (Ecclus. 1:30; 2:1, 17; 4:2, 6; En. 22:3–7; Bar. 2:17; Sibyl. Or. 678, 683, *et al.*). The body belongs to the earth, is mortal, and is antagonistic to the spirit (Sibyl. Or. 678–83). In En., chaps. 1–37, the fact that the visions were received by Enoch before he was married may be an indication of that ascetic tendency which finds the roots of evil in the body. While the soul and the body are made for each other in the Twelve Patriarchs (Twelve Patr. T. Naph. 2:2, 3) in accordance with the best Platonic schema, yet in the same book the body is represented as the seat of evil. To the author the liver is the source of wrath.[1] Such significant phrases as the following are found: e.g., "Since my liver was mercilessly set against Joseph" (T. Gad 5:11); "The spirit of fighting in the liver and gall" (T. Reub. 3:4; cf. T. Zeb. 2:4; T. Naph. 2:8; T. Sim. 2:4; 4:1). Even more clearly is the same doctrine presented in the Wisdom of Solomon. "A corruptible body [σῶμα] weigheth down the soul and the earthly tabernacle [σκῆνος] lieth heavy on a mind that is full of cares" (Wisd. of Sol. 9:15; cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 83D, 81C; where σκηνή is used in the same way). Or again we read that Wisdom shall not dwell in a body which is subject to sin (Wisd. of Sol. 1:4, κατάχρεῳ ἁμαρτίας), a phrase that is similarly used by Polybius and Sophocles. The same idea also underlies, "Not being ignorant that their nature by birth was evil and their wickedness inborn" (Wisd. of Sol. 12:10; cf. 4:3–6; 12:11; 8:19, 20).

Similar is, "I also am mortal like to all, and am sprung from one born of the earth" (Wisd. of Sol. 7:1). A further passage which is difficult of interpretation is, "Now I was a child of parts, and a good soul fell to my lot; Nay rather being good, I came into a body undefiled" (Wisd. of Sol. 8:19, 20). While the dualism is striking, the last phrase is often interpreted as meaning that the body is morally neutral, only reflecting the virtues or the guilt of the animating spirit. On the whole, however, the indications seem clear that, like Plato, our author

[1] While these expressions by the definite way in which they relate the passions to the physical organs seem to show Grecian coloring, they nevertheless strongly remind us of the Old Testament use of כליות (Jer. 12:2; Job 19:27; Prov. 23:16; Ps. 16:7; 73:21) and לב or לבב (Isa. 30:29; Jer. 15:16; Ps. 25:17; 13:3; 19:6).

thought of the body as the seat of evil (*Phaedo* 83D, 81C). In a chapter of Enoch which seems to show that ascetic interest which arose from a belief in the inherent evil of the flesh the same thought again recurs. Speaking of the humble "who afflict their bodies and are [for that] recompensed by God," the author further describes them as those "Who loved God and loved neither gold nor silver nor any of the goods of the world, but gave their bodies to torture, and who, since they came into being, longed not after earthly food, but regarded their bodies as a breath that passeth away, and lived accordingly, and were much tried by the Lord, and their spirits were found pure so that they should bless His name" (En. 108:8, 9). A somewhat different statement is found in a later writer. The author of IV Maccabees says in regard to the desires, that some belong to the soul and others to the body; and over each of these classes the reasoning appears to bear sway (IV Macc. 1:31). This appears to be, however, rather the basis of an analysis of the passions than a statement of genetic relation (cf. IV Macc. 1:20–27; 2:4). From the above it will readily be seen that while the Jewish writers of this period were but slightly interested in psychology, they were nevertheless strongly influenced by their environment in their conception of the body.

Much more striking, however, is the Grecian influence on the idea of the essential principle of man. The soul is the chief part of man. Various very significant words are used to designate this inner principle. *Ψυχή, πνεῦμα, νοῦς, φρήν, σύνεσις* with a number of writers are synonymous terms. In the Twelve Patriarchs we find *πνεῦμα* used as referring to the senses (Twelve Patr. T. Reub. 2:3—3:2). In this peculiar passage which, it has been said, presents ideas found nowhere else outside of Stoic literature (Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, II, 297, and *Comm., in loc.*) it seems the soul is dissected into eight different parts, five of which represent the senses, the other three being respectively: power of reproduction, the fact of sleep, and the spirit of life. That this is influenced by Stoicism is seen by the fact that the Stoics distinctly taught that the soul was divided into eight parts, much the same as the above (Plutarch *De Plac.* iv. 21; Charles, *Test. Twelve Patr.*, 4). In MS 248 of Sirach in an interpolation which follows 17:4, there is a similar eightfold division of the soul (Charles, *Test. Twelve Patr.*, 5). Slavonic Enoch has also preserved the marks of the same influence: "I gave him seven natures: hearing . . . . , sight . . . . , smell . . . . , touch . . . . , taste. . . . . " For the remaining part of the passage which is corrupt, Charles, working from a similar passage in Philo, suggests

that "the vocal organs and the generative powers" may be the phrases required for the text (Slav. En. 30:9). But apart from this sporadic feature, we find that the whole trend of this time was to interest itself in the conception of the soul as distinct from the body. Some of the thinkers even went farther and endeavored to divide the inner life into two parts: the soul and the spirit. Up to the beginning of the first century B.C. these two views—dichotomy and trichotomy—held their place side by side. In Ecclesiasticus we find ψυχή as parallel to νοῦς (Ecclus. 1:30; 2:1, 17; 4:2, 6; 5:2; 23:6), synonymous with πνεῦμα (Ecclus. 9:9) and equivalent to καρδία (Ecclus. 1:28; 2:1, 17; 3:29; 4:2). En., chaps. 1–36 shows the same attitude. Most frequently ψυχή and πνεῦμα are used indifferently (En. 22:3; 9:3; 22:5–7; 9:11–13). Three texts, however, have to be taken into consideration. In 9:10; 16:1; 22:3; the phrase, "the spirits of the souls of the dead," is found in variants. It is difficult here to escape the conclusion that some of those reworking the manuscripts were thoroughgoing trichotomists. In the same period, moreover, we find the doctrine of trichotomy expressed clearly in Ecclus. 38:23; Bar. 2:17, and Tob. 3:6. In the following century, however, dichotomy held quite general sway. This may be illustrated by the following passages: II Macc. 6:30; 7:37; 14:38; 15:30; En. 98:10; 102:5, 11; 103:3, 7, 8; Ps. of Sol. 4:13; 9:19; 15:11; 16:14. What seems to be a glimpse of trichotomy appears in this century but once, viz., II Macc. 7:22, 23.

The belief in the pre-existence of the soul, which is stated more than once in this period, is the last needed evidence for the influence of the Greek dualism on the thinkers of these days. In three passages the author of the Wisdom of Solomon more than implies such a pre-existence. In 15:8, he uses the expression: "When the life [τῆς ψυχῆς] which was loaned him shall be demanded." Again in 16:11 is a passage even more convincing, "For as much as he knew not his Maker, and Him that inspired into him an active soul [καὶ τὸν ἐμπνεύσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν] and breathed in a living spirit [πνεῦμα]." In the light of these two passages and the general Greek tone of the book, the same interpretation would seem to be needed for 8:19, 20, "For I was a child of parts, and a good soul fell to my lot; nay rather being good, I came into a body undefiled."[1] The Assumption of Moses teaches that

[1] F. C. Porter, in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies, in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, Vol. I, under the title "The Pre-existence of the Soul in the Book of Wisdom and in the Rabbinical Writings," has done a very careful piece of work in which he does not accept the above view which till recently has been quite commonly held. His arguments which have been accepted by Maldyn Hughes in *Ethics of the Jewish*

"Moses was designed, and devised and prepared from before the foundation of the world to be the mediator of the divine covenant" (Assump. Mos. 1:14; cf. En. 48:2; 62:6, where Son of Man is pre-existent). The idea which, at best, is limited to one individual takes on a wider sweep in Slavonic Enoch. To this writer all souls are pre-existent: "For every soul was created eternally before the foundation of the world" (Slav. En. 23:5; *contra*, Hughes, *Eth. Jew. Apoc. Lit.*, 201). This thoroughly Greek conception was made a part of the system of Philo (*Leg. All.*, I, 12, 28; *De Somn.*, I, 22), was accepted by the Essenes (Jos., *Jew. Wars*, II, viii, 11), and later became a prevailing dogma in Judaism.

The idea of immortality in its various phases follows on logically from the last discussion. The Greeks, who most influenced Judaism, believed in an immortality of the soul, but not of the body, hence their conception should be classed as spiritual as opposed to material. The Hebrews, however, in their Scriptures left very few statements which are definite. To quote R. H. Charles: "In Job it [immortality] emerges merely as an inspiration. Only in Pss. 49 and 73 (if our interpretation is valid) does it rise to the stage of conviction" (*Enc. Bib.*, 1347). While this no doubt is true, we must recognize that individual immortality lay implicit in much of the teaching of the Old Testament. Likewise the doctrine of the resurrection, in any crystallized form, plays no important part in its thought. From symbolic passages of national import, such as Ezek., chap. 37, developed under the influence of eschatological conceptions, we find at least two passages which deal with the general idea of resurrection. In Isaiah we are told, "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise, awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth her dead" (Isa. 24:19). In Daniel, the other significant passage, we find, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2). Appreciating the development between these two passages,

Apocryphal Literature, 177 f., are to the effect that the idea of pre-existence in the Book of Wisdom is essentially Jewish and not Greek. He argues that the Jew thought of the person as composed of body which was from below and of spirit or breath which was from above; while the Greek thought of the soul as the thinking self or the person. While Dr. Porter marshals all possible details to maintain that body and soul are used in the Book of Wisdom in the Jewish sense, not so much over against each other as together constituting the real personality, it seems to the present writer that the author is not only using Greek phraseology, but, though perhaps not consistent throughout, he is tinctured with Greek thought (cf. Charles, *Enc. Bib.*, 1368, 1371, and *Apoc. and Pseud.*, II, 531–32).

which took place in a little over a century and a half, we judge that the idea of a bodily resurrection was not uncommon in the years preceding our period.

Turning now to the material in hand, we are again aware of the attempt of many Jews to meet the Greeks on their own ground. In Ecclesiasticus the old Hebrew idea is still dominant. For the individual there is no immortality. "Who shall give praise to the Most High in the grave, ... because the son of man is not immortal and all men are earth and ashes" (Ecclus. 17:25–32; cf. 22:11; 44:9). The perpetuation of a name is an incentive for a good life and is one of the highest rewards (Ecclus. 37:26; 39:9–11; 41:13; 44:14). This negative side, however, like some similar expressions of the Old Testament (cf. Job 14:10–14), seems to be a groping after a conscious future existence. The beginning of that thought may very well underlie many of the passages of this book (Ecclus. 17:17–32; 14:16; 41:1–13). A few other sections of the book present what appears to be a gleam of a positive doctrine. "The spirit of those that fear the Lord shall live; . . . . for He is his hope" (Ecclus. 34:13,14). "Blessed are they that saw thee, and they have been beautified with love: For we also shall surely live" (Ecclus. 48:11; cf. 40:11, 12). In the Epistle of Baruch the old Hebrew conception is stated in such an emphatic negative way as to suggest antagonism against the permeating influence of Greek thought: "For the dead that are in the grave, whose breath is taken away from their bodies, will give unto the Lord neither glory nor righteousness; but the soul that is greatly vexed, which goeth stooping and feeble, and the eyes that fail, and the hungry soul, will give thee glory and righteousness, O Lord" (Bar. 2:17, 18). To Baruch, life (ζωή) is the ultimate individual reward (Bar. 4:2; 3:9, 11, 14; 2:17) and glory and might is the future hope of the nation (Bar. 4:18, 21, 23–25).

The latest type of Jewish thought, viz., Daniel, is followed, though perhaps narrowed down, in both I and II Enoch (En., chaps. 1–36 and chaps. 37–71). The resurrection is limited to Israel and is to precede the judgment (En. 22:1–4; 51:1; 61:5). Alongside of this is held out the indefinite promise of long life to the righteous (En. 5:9; 25:4–6; cf. 62:15, 16).

In the Book of Jubilees we meet a definite statement concerning the future which is a turning-point, and shows unmistakably the influence of their neighbors: "And their bones will rest in the earth, and their spirits will have much joy" (Jub. 23:31). Here, for the first time, a

blessed immortality awaits the spirit, but there is no hope of a resurrection of the body.

The old lines in general are followed by the Book of the Twelve Patriarchs. The resurrection is a physical one, and the eternal life which is promised is to be enjoyed on a renovated earth (Twelve Patr. T. Dan. 5:12; T. Zeb. 10:3; T. Jud. 25:3–5; T. Asher 5:3; 6:4–6; 7:3; T. Benj. 10:6–10). The tone is essentially the same in II Maccabees. The unrighteous, at least the tyrant, will have no resurrection to life (II Macc. 7:14). The righteous, those who belong to Israel, and particularly those who suffer martyrdom, shall be raised to a life everlasting (II Macc. 7:9, 14, 23, 30, 36; 12:44), which will be in a physical body (II Macc. 7:11, 23; 14:16), and will enjoy an earthly messianic kingdom (7:29, 33, 37; 14:15).

Third Enoch (En., chaps. 91–108) swings clear over to the Grecian statement of the doctrine. The author, in a long passage, definitely and vigorously assails the Old Testament idea of the future world (En. 102:4—104:9). He exhorts the righteous not to grieve if their souls descend into Sheol. Then he summarizes the orthodox Sadducean thought in a passage quite similar to Ecclus. 2:14–16 and 3:19–21: "As we die so die the righteous and what benefit do they reap from their deeds?" (En. 102:6–8). Following this, he declares that immortality of the soul is the only goal and hope. The wicked shall be in an everlasting Sheol of fire (En. 98:3, 10; 99:9, 11; 103:7). The promise to the righteous is, "and the spirits of you who die in righteousness will live and rejoice and be glad, and their spirits shall not perish, but their memorial will be before the face of the Great One unto all generations of the world" (En. 103:4).

When we come to the Psalms of Solomon and Wisdom the atmosphere is Grecian, though the ideas are in general a development of the Hebrew thought. In the Psalms, for those who fear the Lord and do righteousness there is eternal life (*εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, Ps. Sol. 3:16; 9:4; 12:4–7; 13:5, 9, 11; 14:2, 3, 7; 15:8, 15; 10:9). The doctrine of retribution in the eternal life is strongly asserted (Ps. Sol. 2:7; 17:30–32, 37, 39; 9:9; 13:5; 15:14; 17:10). Destruction which savors of annihilation awaits the sinner (Ps. Sol. 3:13; 9:9; 12:7; 13:10; 14:6; 15:11). In the Wisdom of Solomon, immortality again is spiritual and not physical, hence Grecian (Wisd. of Sol. 2:23; 3:4; 6:19). This writer, even more clearly than Enoch (En. 102:4—104:2), conceives death to be only a semblance which is the beginning of real life. "But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch

them. In the sight of the universe they seem to die; and their departure [ἔξοδος] is taken for misery . . . . but they are at peace. . . . . Yet is their hope full of immortality" (Wisd. of Sol. 3:1–4). This most likely took color from current Greek thought. Similar to it is the expression of Euripides, which freely rendered is, "Who knows whether life is death or death is life?" (cf. Wace, *Apocrypha*, I, 437). Variants of the same idea are found in many Greek writers (Maximus Tyrus, *Dissert.*, XXV, 285; Plat., *Epinom.*, 992*b;* Philo, *det. pot. insid. Opp.* I, 200; cf. Grimm, *Comm.*, *in loc.*). We meet here also Grecian words used in a quite Grecian sense. Ἀθανασία (immortality) is of frequent occurrence (Wisd. of Sol. 3:4; 4:1; 8:13, 17; 15:3). Its significance is never physical. It seems to have been first used by Plato in respect to the gods. Ἀφθαρσία (incorruptible immortality), found in Wisd. of Sol. 2:23; 6:18, 19, and only again in IV Macc. 17:12—though of frequent use in Philo—conveys a decidedly Grecian idea. Θάνατος (death), following Platonic usage, is never used for annihilation. While death may be escaped through virtue (Wisd. of Sol. 1:15; 2:22; 6:18), yet in general through death the soul enters upon retribution. Here, again, is seen the mind of Plato. The result of Grecian tendencies is again seen in Slavonic Enoch. A blessed immortality of endless life is the position of those who in patience and meekness accomplish the number of their days (Slav. En. 50:2; 65:8–10; 66:6). The whole tone of the book suggests, if it does not prove, that there is no resurrection of the body. The attitude toward the future life is essentially the same in the Book of IV Maccabees. For the wicked there is eternal torment (IV Macc. 9:9, 32; 10:11, 15; 12:19; 13:15; 18:5, 22), while there awaits a blessed immortality for the righteous (IV Macc. 9:9, 22; 10:15; 13:17; 17:4, 18; 18:23).

In the Apocalypse of Baruch we have a reversion to the earlier Hebrew idea. Here we have a statement in its most developed form of physical resurrection: "For the earth will then assuredly restore the dead, which it now receives, in order to preserve them, making no change in their form, but as it has received them, so will it restore them, and as I have delivered them unto it, so also shall it raise them. For then it will be necessary to show to the living that the dead have come to life again, and that those who have departed have returned" (Apoc. of Bar. 50:2–3; cf. 49:2—51:3).

Thus, so far as the doctrine of immortality is concerned, we find that under Grecian influence the Hebrew doctrine of a bodily resurrection came to its gradual elaboration through the writers of Twelve Patri-

archs, II Maccabees, and Apocalypse of Baruch. Most of the writers of this period, however, made their writings palatable to their rulers by adopting the entirely spiritual conception of the resurrection. The chief leaders in this movement were: Enoch, Psalms of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon, a few passages in II Maccabees, and Slavonic Enoch.

To some of the religious thinkers the freedom of the will became a problem in this age. This question had in no way seriously disturbed their forefathers. Constantly in the Old Testament we find the idea of absolute divine sovereignty and human free will lying side by side without any attempt to reconcile them. It was vastly different with the philosophic Greeks. The physics of their early writers, indeed even of the Stoics, held resolutely to the principle of determinism. Plato, in part, broke with this when he suggested that the reason why the Creator had not produced a perfect work was because He was limited by the indeterminateness (*τὸ ἀπείρον*) of the phenomenal existence (*Tim.* 46C; 48A; 68E; cf. Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, I, 62). However, in the sphere of ethics the conclusions of a Monistic philosophy were not followed. By devious and many arguments they maintained the power of choice, if not always in a complete way for the individual, yet in a real way for the universal *λόγος*. Though destiny and fate provided that bad dispositions should not be free from sins, yet the general conclusion was that every man's own will governed his moral impulses and actions. In ways which seemed harmonious to the individual philosopher, these two poles of thought were bridged so as to preserve the universe to him as a metaphysical unity.

Among these Judaistic writers sovereignty is always an axiomatic truth. To reconcile individual freedom with that is their task. Ecclesiasticus holds to predestination, on the one hand (Ecclus. 16:26; 23:20; 33:7–13; 39:20), and affirms as emphatically, on the other hand, the principle of freedom (Ecclus. 15:11–20; 17:6; 21:11, 27, 28; 33:1; cf. Hart, *Ecclus. in Greek*, 154). In I Enoch (chaps. 1–36) the origin of sin is traced back to the angels under the term watchers. This reinterpretation of Gen. 6:1–4, under foreign influence, was the writer's method of adjusting himself to the thought-world in which he moved. The giants, who were the offspring of the unnatural union of fallen angels and women, became the evil spirits upon the earth, who, though invisible, were the efficient causes in the oppressions, the wars, and the evils of humanity (En., chaps. 15, 16, 6). In II Enoch (chaps. 37–71) we find Satan as the ultimate cause of sin. He it was who caused the watchers to fall (40:7; 54:6; cf. 69:8–11, a Noachic fragment where Eve is led

astray by demoniac agencies). Yet in spite of this explanation of the origin of sin, freedom is assumed on the part of the authors of both I and II Enoch (En. 5:1–4, 5; 27:2; 41:1). In Tobit, the will is the direct cause of transgression, hence the individual alone is blameworthy (Tob. 4:5). The Book of Jubilees carries both ideas side by side. Pre-ordination is expressed (Jub. 5:13), as is also moral accountability (Jub. 41:25; 33:16). In the Epistle of Baruch indeterminism is simply assumed (Bar. 2:29, 30). The Twelve Patriarchs is entirely orthodox, for both sides of the question are emphasized. It goes farther, however, and makes an attempt at reconciliation. The help which the human will may receive from the Lord brings to the one fearing God enlightenment and deliverance (Twelve Patr. T. Jud. 20:1; T. Sim. 3:4, 5; T. Benj. 3:4, 5). En., chaps. 91–108, is more positive as to indeterminism than any previous writer. To this writer "Sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man himself has created it, and into general condemnation will those fall who commit it" (En. 98:4; cf. 91:18; 94:3, 4). The same seems to be the doctrine in the Psalms of Solomon (Ps. Sol. 9:7). In the Wisdom of Solomon there is divine foreknowledge (Wisd. of Sol. 14:5; 17:2; 11:20; 12:10), but along with this, freedom is asserted (Wisd. of Sol. 1:16; 5:3; 13:6–9; 19:2). Here, as in the case of Jubilees, victory may be gained over evil through the strength of God (Wisd. of Sol. 12:16; 9:4–6; cf. Jub. 21:25; 22:10, Assump. Mos. 12:7). The privilege of choice between the two ways, good and evil, light and darkness, was given to Adam, according to Slavonic Enoch (Slav. En. 30:15, originating perhaps in Jer. 21:8). While in this book there is a determinism as to the number of souls and the place of each in the hereafter (Slav. En. 58:5) and a limitation placed upon each man's freedom by his own ignorance (Slav. En. 30:16), yet that responsibility which can be based only in moral freedom is assumed throughout (Slav. En. 30:11; cf. F. C. Porter "The Yeçer Hara," *Bib. and Sem. Studies*, 154–56). On the other hand, however, he follows the lead that Satan, through ambition, was the cause of moral evil (Slav. En. 29:4, 5; 31:1–3). Further, he it was who seduced Eve and thus started flowing the currents of evil (Slav. En. 30:17; 31:2, 6; cf. Ecclus. 25:24). Demons are represented as the inciting cause of all sin in the Martyrdom of Isaiah (Mart. Isa. 1:9; 2:4; 3:11; 5:1), and Beliar is credited specially with being the angel of lawlessness (Mart. Isa. 2:4–6). A most definite conclusion to that which must have been a growing problem in the minds of many is presented in the Apocalypse of Baruch. His conclusion can best be summed up in his own words:

"For though Adam first sinned, and brought untimely death upon all, yet of those who were born from him, each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come, and again, each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come. . . . . Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each one of us has been the Adam of his own soul" (Apoc. Bar. 54:15–19; cf. 15:6; 19:1–3; 59:2; 18:1, 2; 85:9). Another turn is given in IV Esdras, in which the conclusion reached is that sin is due to a grain of evil seed which has been sown in the heart (IV Esdr. 4:30; 7:92; cf. 3:21; 7:118; cf. F. C. Porter, "The Yeçer Hara," *Bib. and Sem. Studies*, 146–52). The same author goes farther, and holds that all is predetermined by the sovereign power: "He hath worlds in a balance, and by measure hath he measured the times, and by number hath he numbered them; and he shall not move them or stir them, until the said measure be fulfilled" (IV Esdr. 4:36). Man can neither find out nor turn aside the purpose of the Almighty (IV Esdr. 5:34–40; 6:6; 7:11, 70). Yet withal the writer is a good Jew and holds to freedom and responsibility (IV Esdr. 7:27–30; 7:21, 72, 79; 8:56–62; 9:10, 11). One of his strongest passages is "The Most High willeth not that men should come to naught; but they which he created have themselves defiled the name of him that made them" (IV Esdr. 8:59, 60).

In our study of the psychology of this period, it seems fitting to refer to the emergence and use of the word for "conscience." That this idea was existent in the olden time we doubt not (Isa. 30:15; Jer. 20:3, 4). But the Hebrew has no word whereby to express it. The Greek word *συνείδησις* seems to have first been used in Periander by the Stoics. Again it is found in Euripides' *Orest.* 396. It is apparent that before the second century B.C. it had become a technical word in the psychology of the Stoics. In the LXX translation of the Hebrew Scriptures the word is only once used, viz., in Eccles. 10:20, where it is used for מַדָּע ("thought"). In point of time, its first fully developed use is that found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. In Test. Reuben we read, "Even until now my conscience causeth me anguish on account of my impiety" (T. Reub. 4:3). The action of conscience is graphically set before the reader in Test. Judah, "And in the midst is the spirit of understanding of the mind, to which it belongeth to turn whithersoever it will. And the works of truth and the works of deceit are written upon the hearts of men, ... and the sinner is burnt up by his own heart and cannot raise his face to the judge" (T. Jud. 20:2–5). The same thought is expressed in Test. Gad, "For he that is just and

humble is ashamed to do what is unjust, being reproved not of another, but of his own heart, because the Lord looketh on his inclination" (T. Gad 5:3). The word is again used in its exact sense in Wisdom of Solomon: "For wickedness condemned by her own witness is very timorous and, being pressed with conscience, always forecasteth grievous things" (Wisd. of Sol. 17:11). While the verb (συνειδέναι) is found in three of the books of the Maccabees (I Macc. 4:21; II Macc. 4:41; III Macc. 2:8), the noun is not again found within the bounds of our literature. It, however, is constantly found in Philo and in the New Testament.

From the foregoing it is seen that the Jewish writers, intentionally or unintentionally, were influenced by the demands of the Greek culture in the field of psychology, and endeavored to meet them in the following ways. Most of the writers unhesitatingly and quite naturally follow the Greek dualism. A number under the dominancy of certain Greek tenets held that the body is evil and the source of evil. Thus for it there is no resurrection. Others in opposition thereto, and brought to clearness of expression thereby, built up the dogma of the resurrection of the body in all its features. Following the Greeks, there are those who declare that the soul is pure spirit, the essential part of man, pre-existent and immortal. Others produce a polemic, which makes positive the queries and the fears of some of the Old Testament writers, and declare that for the individual there is no life beyond the grave. A few take a side departure with the Stoics and analyze the soul into eight different senses, and others again with the same school attribute souls to all life, vegetable and animal alike. Most, however, follow the general tendency and are trichotomists—quite largely so in the second century B.C.—or dichotomists, prevailingly so during the last century before Christ. Likewise under their teachers they gain a definite expression for the conception of the rôle which conscience plays in the individual life. As for the principle of freedom of the will, the influence of the period is seen in three ways: (1) We find an effort to explain the origin of evil as the work of evil angels or of Satan. (2) There were those who endeavored to unite free will and sovereignty, by the nexus of a divine dynamic which enforced the will of the individual. (3) Others made the categorical statement that the will was free, and paid much less consideration to the question of sovereignty than would have been consistent to the early Hebrews.

C. APOLOGETIC IN ETHICAL CONCEPTIONS

It is recognized that the psychology of any people is fundamental to their ethical conceptions. We have seen that in spite of certain

attempts to give a philosophic account of the origin of sin, the freedom of the will became the axiom of the age. This tendency toward subjectivity worked itself out along another line in the idea of *conscience* as the inner monitor in the field of morals. These movements give us the foundation for an advance in ethics upon cultural lines. In this period we still hear the messages of the old prophets of Israel. Sometimes, it is true, their principles are conveyed through that apocalyptic symbolism which threatens to obscure them. Often, however, the annunciation of great moral principles is heard in tones as ringing as ever heard in the heyday of prophecy (cf. Twelve Patr. T. Gad 6; Slav. En. 42:6–14; 52:1–4; 63:1–4; 66:6–8). One brief illustration out of many is sufficient to convince us that the fires which had been burning in the hearts of the old prophets were not all quenched: "Blessed is he who executes a just judgment, not for the sake of recompense, but for the sake of righteousness, expecting nothing in return; a sincere judgment shall afterwards come to him. Blessed is he who clothes the naked with a garment, and gives his bread to the hungry. Blessed is he who gives a just judgment for the orphan and the widow, and assists everyone who is wronged" (Slav. En. 42:7–9). While there are numerous illustrations such as the foregoing, which prove that the old Hebrew spirit was well preserved, yet there are indications not a few which show not only that these people were submerged in a Grecian atmosphere, but that some of their moralists had imbibed deeply the teaching of their schools.

In the new environment they gain a new outlook on life. The spirit of the pleasure-loving Greeks was infectious. The *carpe diem* of the Epicureans found a ready lodging-place in the thoughts of some of the serious-minded Hebrews. Sirach is more of a Greek than a Jew when he concludes, "The gladness of the heart is the life of man, and the joyfulness of a man prolongeth his days. Love thine own soul, and comfort thy heart . . . . " (Ecclus. 30:22–25).[1] The same influence seems to have left its mark on him when he exhorts his hearers to "Defraud not thyself of a good day; and let not the portion of a good desire pass thee by. . . . . Give, and take, and beguile thy soul . . . . " (Ecclus. 14:14–16).

The Greek passion for beauty of form was not without effect on the Jews in some quarters. This manifested itself, not only in the ready

[1] It is quite possible as Charles suggests (*Apoc. and Pseud.*, I, 276), that as a similar attitude toward life has been found in Babylonian literature, this may be a parallel and not due to Hellenic coloring. It seems likely, however, that Greek thought was the reagent that brought this to its first expression among religious leaders of Judaism.

response of the Jewish youth to the *gymnasia*, but also quite naturally colored literature. It is admitted that beauty of form and face is a thought which is not absent from the Old Testament. In the early literature, beauty of appearance (יפת־מראה) as applied to woman is found in Gen. 12:11; 29:17; II Sam. 14:27, and beauty of form (יפת־תאר) is also mentioned in three places (Gen. 29:17; Deut. 21:11; I Sam. 25:3). Outside of these passages the beauty of woman is rarely referred to in pre-Grecian times. In the literature from this period there is a growing abundance of such characterizations, and their significance leans toward that of physical beauty. In Canticles, which shows Greek influence, we find, as we might expect, an exuberance of epithet for beauty (Cant. 1:8, 15, 16; 2:10, 13; 4:1, 7; 5:9; 6:4, 10). That these are in large part physical characterizations needs no serious defense here. A casual glance at chap. 4 is conclusive proof. A similar strain is suggested throughout the story of Esther (cf. 2:7). In the Grecian addition to Esther this idea is developed. Carrying herself delicately (*τρυφερευομένη*), she entered before the king. "And she was ruddy through the perfection of her beauty [*κάλλους*], and her countenance was cheerful and amiable" (15:3, 4). In Susanna and Judith we again meet the same features. Susanna was a very delicate woman (*τρυφερὰ σφόδρα*) and beauteous of countenance (*καλὴ τῷ εἴδει*, vs. 31; cf. vs. 56). That this was physical is clearly shown by vs. 56, which declares her beauty deceived the elders. Judith is commended by Holofernes for her beauty of face (*ἐν κάλλει προσώπου*, 11:21; cf. 10:23), and he approves of her pretty or courteous (*ἀστεία*) countenance and her pleasant (*ἀγαθή*) words (11:21). Expressions and ideals such as these were common in Greek, and go back at least as early as Aristotle. In the Nicomachean Ethics (IV, 3, 5) we find *οἳ μικροὶ ἀστεῖοι καὶ σύμμετροι καλοὶ δ' οὔ*. In the Psalms of Solomon the beauty (*κάλλος*) of an ungodly woman may be the cause of sin (Ps. Sol. 16:8; cf. Prov. 6:25; Ecclus. 9:8; 25:21). Comeliness or good form (*εὐμορίαν*) is one of the strongest allurements from which wisdom was able to turn aside (Wisd. of Sol. 7:10). Similarly in the Apocalypse of Baruch, beauty and gracefulness are two things which should be eschewed for the sake of the higher (Apoc. Bar. 10:17; cf. 21:23; 48:35). At the same time this writer uses the same word to express his ideal of future glory (Apoc. Bar. 51:3, 10; 54:8). In Tobit, Naphthali, the father of Tobias, is described by the current Greek phrase (*κάλλον καὶ ἀγαθόν*, Tob. 7:7). These seem to be adequate indications that the minds of the Jewish people readily adopted many of the phrases and ideals of their neighbors.

The above paragraph not only suggests that beauty of form found a large place in the writings of this period, but also that concomitant therewith the attitude toward woman was Grecianized. With the Hebrew people it is true that woman was considered subordinate to man (Gen. 3:16). There are traces in the Old Testament literature where crude and primitive conditions have been preserved (Exod. 21:7–11). Yet the status of woman in the Old Testament, as a whole, is higher than that held by most people in a similar condition of civilization. "Honor thy father and thy mother" (Exod. 20:12), presents in succinct form what must have been an early ideal of those people. Later it is put even more strongly, "Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father" (Lev. 19:3). The early creation-story recognizes the wife as the "help-meet" of man (Gen. 2:18), and it is in later Hebrew literature that we meet what might well be termed the classics on the ideal woman. The mother, the daughter-in-law, the thrifty housewife, and the sweetheart are immemorably enshrined in Isa. 49:15, Ruth, Prov., chap. 31, and the Song of Solomon, respectively.

Far different was it in the Greek literature and life. In the *Odyssey*, Penelope is reproved by Telemachus and told to go to her own apartments. Respect for woman was not very high. In Alexandria she appeared unveiled in the streets and moved among and chatted freely with the men. What some of the teachers had lauded in theory—freedom of intercourse—was an all too prevalent practice. The home, owing to theories of military training and actual war, was often disorganized. Social vice was in sufficiently good standing to permit the female courtesan to figure prominently in the plays of Menander. In the city of Corinth there were one thousand women devoted to immorality at the shrine of Aphrodite alone. Thus it is easily seen that here again there was a wide divergence between these two peoples.

The influence of the looser morals and the lesser reverence of the Greeks was speedily felt. The faults of women are as a sweet morsel under the tongue of the Son of Sirach. "A wicked woman is as a yoke of oxen shaken to and fro: He that taketh hold of her is as one that graspeth a scorpion" (Ecclus. 26:7). "Give me any plague but the plague of the heart; and any wickedness but the wickedness of a woman" (Ecclus. 25:13; cf. 25:16–26; 26:5–12; 42:9–14; 36:21–26, *et al.*). It is not impossible that Prov., chap. 5, may have been written in order to meet a condition of morals similar to that existing in Palestine in the time of Antiochus. This condition is described in II Macc. 6:1–4: "Not long after this the king sent an old man of Athens to compel the Jews to

depart from the laws of their fathers and not to live after the laws of God. . . . . The coming in of this mischief was sore and grievous to the people; for the temple was filled with riot and revelling by the Gentiles, who dallied with harlots, and had to do with women within the circuit of the holy places, and besides this they brought in things that were not lawful." It is apparent that such influences would lead many to assume toward woman the same attitude both in theory and practice as that of their masters (Twelve Patr. T. Jud. 23:2).

On the other hand, however, the old reverence for women still asserted itself. They endeavored to offset the loose tendencies by exhortation and regulation. In the Twelve Patriarchs the youth is enjoined not even to speak with the women on the street: "Pay no heed to the face of a woman, nor associate with another man's wife, nor meddle with the affairs of womankind" (T. Reub. 3:10). "And command the women likewise not to associate with men, that they also may be pure in mind. For constant meetings, even though the ungodly deed be not wrought, are to them an irremediable disease and to us a destruction of Beliar and an eternal reproach" (T. Reub. 6:2, 3; cf. 4:1–5; 5:1–4; T. Jud. 14:2, 3; 15:2; 23:2; T. Dan. 5:5; T. Benj. 8:2; 9:1, *et al.*). Virgins were required to remain within doors (II Macc. 3:19; III Macc. 1:18; Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* 31), and intermarriage with the Gentiles was strenuously opposed (Twelve Patr. T. Jud. 14:6; 17:1). Moreover, they created for their own satisfaction and encouragement such pure and beautiful characters as Susanna and Judith, who in fictitious situations embodied the lofty Jewish ideal. Thus in spite of the inroads of Grecian *laissez faire*, yea perhaps strengthened because of those very influences, they preserved for the New Testament times one of the highest conceptions of womanhood the world had ever known.

A new ambition, stimulated by Grecian ideals, seems to have been born in the minds of some of the Jews at the very period when the struggle with their enemy was strongest. Personal ambition now breaks out among the people, whose former leaders had set up personal humility and "God's glory" as the ideal. "Fame" and "Name," which are found so frequently in the Maccabees, are surely Greek ideals on the lips of the Hebrews. "And they said, let us also get us a name, and let us go fight against the Gentiles" (I Macc. 5:57; cf. 2:51, 6:44; 9:10; 14:29; 3:3; II Macc. 6:23, *et al.*; cf. Ecclus. 4:7; 7:7). To the same desire we may well attribute the monument which Simon had erected over the grave of his father and his brethren (I Macc. 13:27). The people who could not identify the sepulchers of their greatest prophets, because their

religious leaders had discouraged all pagan reverence for the dead, now follow the lead of their most bitter enemies and fashion and adorn the pillars after the most approved Greek art (I Macc. 13:29).

In the ethical realm the Jew further came *en rapport* with the Greek by absorbing the cultural movements of the day, and thus broadening his ethical conceptions. In this respect the four "cardinal virtues" of the Platonists were adopted by some of these apologetes. Temperance, Prudence, Justice, and Fortitude were the virtues which held the dominant place in the Platonic school (Cicero *De fin.* v. 23, 67; cf. *De off.* i. 5). Two of these, Justice and Prudence, were the common property of the Jews. Justice was proclaimed by the prophets, Prudence had claimed the attention of the sage. Now, however, we find these four bound up together after the manner of the Greeks: "And if a man love righteousness her labors are virtues; for she teacheth temperance [σωφροσύνη] and prudence [φρόνησις], justice [δικαιοσύνη], and fortitude [ἀνδρεία]" (Wisd. of Sol. 8:7). The same combination is found in IV Macc. 1:18. In IV Macc. 5:22, 23, Piety (εὐσέβεια) which, by the way, was one of the cardinal virtues for Socrates, displaces Prudence. In IV Macc. 5:10, high-mindedness (μεγαλόψυχος) and brotherly love (φιλάδελφος) both flavored by Grecian ideals, take the place of the two peculiarly Hebrew virtues, Justice and Prudence. The same combination is fundamental to the ethics of Philo (*Leg. All.* I, 19–23, *et al.*). While it may be true that by critical examination we perhaps do not find the exact shade of thought in the Wisdom of Solomon and IV Maccabees that is found in Plato and his followers, it is quite apparent that the Hebrews here appropriated as much of the thought of their teachers as their theological system permitted.

While the combination above referred to is found only in the places mentioned, the separate ideas are emphasized in many connections. This is especially true of the two peculiarly Greek virtues. The demand for temperance is found very frequently. The *gymnasia* with its contests emphasized in a very concrete way the obligation of temperance. Spare living, painful effort, self-mastery were the conditions of success. Various phrases were used to express this idea. Besides temperance (σωφροσύνη), there are used such words as self-control (ἐγκράτεια), freedom from passions (ἐταραξία), and phrases such as the mean state (μηδὲν ἄγαν) and the mind as ruler of the passions. Self-control (ἐγκράτεια) goes back to Aristotle where its technical significance is, the mind's mastery of the passions. This is a favorite word and idea with the author of Ecclesiasticus. In the LXX the paragraph (Ecclus.

18:30–33) is appropriately entitled ἐγκράτεια φυχῆς. The same theme is in Ecclus. 3:21–24; 37:27–31; cf. 31:22. The same thought finds expression in the Psalms of Solomon, where it is said "sufficient is a moderation [τὸ μέτρον] with righteousness" (Ps. Sol. 5:20; cf. Prov. 30:8). In IV Maccabees the same thought rules. Freedom from passion is the goal to be striven for (IV Macc. 8:26). Further, the mind should rule the passions (IV Macc. 1:16, 25; 2:4–6, 8–15, 22; 13:4). In this there is complete agreement with the Stoics.

Fortitude (ἀνδρεία) also becomes incorporated in their ethical scheme. "Be not faint hearted" and "be of good courage" are constant admonitions of Ben Sirach (Ecclus. 2:12; 4:9; 7:10; 19:10, *et al.*). "Let us die manfully" (ἀνδρεία) is the exhortation of Judas to his brethren before the engagement with Bacchides at Elasa (I Macc. 9:10). Faint-heartedness in the time of affliction is not countenanced in the Psalms of Solomon (Ps. Sol. 16:11). In II Maccabees manliness or fortitude is the ideal (II Macc. 14:18, 43; 15:17). The same is counseled in IV Maccabees (IV Macc. 1:18; 2:23; 5:23).

Further, contact with the Greeks, by broadening the moral realm of the Jews had essentially changed the approach to their ethical judgments. Piety and righteousness were the fundamental principles in the old Hebrew ideas, and they were approached from the divine side. Now there is a school which following the Greeks consider moral excellence (ἀρετή) the fundamental principle, and this, mediated as it was by their humanism, had its outlook on the human side. While ἀρετή is found in the LXX, it never there takes the place of any ethical word (Hab. 3:3; Zech. 6:13; Isa. 42:8, 12; 43:21; 63:7; Esth. 4:17, *addit.*). In the interbiblical period it is used to cover the "cardinal virtues" in general (II Macc. 6:31; 15:12, 17; Wisd. of Sol. 4:1; 5:13; 8:7; III Macc. 6:1; IV Macc. 1:2, 8, 10, 30; 2:10; 7:22, *et al.*).

But further, and most important, some of the Jewish teachers followed a school of Greek thinkers to the logical conclusion of the above. Culture now became the synonym of piety (Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 189). It is true, the roots of this are found in the Old Testament itself. The seed was sown in the Book of Deuteronomy: "Behold I have taught you statutes and ordinances, even as Jehovah my God commanded me. . . . . Keep therefore and do them, for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of all the people" (Deut. 4:5, 6). Even more clearly is it expressed in Job 28:28: "Behold the fear of the Lord that is wisdom." Again we find the same thought in Ps. 119:34, "Give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law." A substantial background

is found in the use of דעת in Hosea, Isaiah, the Sages, etc. But now, under the influence of Greek thought, this tendency is accentuated. With Socrates knowledge and virtue were one. Plato taught that speculative (*σοφία*) and practical wisdom (*φρόνησις*) were interchangeable terms (cf. Sidgwick, *Hist. of Ethics*, 44). In Ecclesiasticus it is impossible to distinguish between the use of these two words (cf. Hughes, *Eth. Jew. Apoc. Lit.*, 31). In the first chapter we have a significant series of predicates for the fear of the Lord. The fear of the Lord is "the beginning of wisdom" (vs. 14), "the fulness of wisdom" (vs. 16), "the crown of wisdom" (vs. 18), "the root of wisdom" (vs. 20), "wisdom and instruction" (vs. 17). In other chapters there are many similar designations, as "the source of joy" (Ecclus. 16:2), "the sum of all wisdom" (Ecclus. 19:20), "the way of repentance" (Ecclus. 21:6), "its end is wisdom" (Ecclus. 21:11). The exhortation to put away ignorance emphasizes the same attitude toward knowledge (Ecclus. 5:15; 23:3; cf. Tob. 3:3). We have, of course, to recognize that wisdom here is equivalent to knowledge of the law (Ecclus. 24:1, 2; 1:26; 6:37; 35:1–11; cf. En. 2:1–3; 5:4). This appears to be but the Jewish adaptation in which piety is put as the subject of the Grecian idea, where wisdom is found as the object. It is the Jewish cast of the statement, "virtue is knowledge" (cf. Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, I, 269).

The Psalms of Solomon is the next book to make a contribution on this subject. Wisdom is used as synonymous with virtue. The evil man is one who has perverted wisdom (Ps. Sol. 4:11). There is a hope that Jerusalem may be purged by means of wisdom, by means of righteousness (*ἐν σοφίᾳ, ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*, Ps. Sol. 17:25; cf. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 353). When we compare, "He shall judge the nations and the peoples with the wisdom of his righteousness (*ἐν σοφία δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ*, Ps. Sol. 17:31), with "He shall be wise through the counsel of understanding" (*καὶ σοφὸν ἐνβουλῇ συνεσεῶς καὶ δικαιοσύνης*, Ps. Sol. 17:42), we are convinced on the testimony of this Pharisee that Greek thought had found a responsive chord in the Jewish heart (cf. Ps. Sol. 17:40; 18:8).

In the Wisdom of Solomon, after we have made due allowance for the hypostatizing of Wisdom, we again find ourselves faced by Greek ethical conceptions. "And his power when it is tried maketh manifest the unwise [*τοὺς ἄφρονας*], for into a malicious soul wisdom [*σοφία*] shall not enter" (Wisd. of Sol. 1:3–5). "The multitude of the wise are the welfare of the world, but wisdom will have no fellowship with an envious man" (Wisd. of Sol. 6:23, 24). Kings are admonished to learn

wisdom that they may not fall away (Wisd. of Sol. 6:9), and this is the panacea which shall quickly remove all care (Wisd. of Sol. 6:15). The gift of wisdom is the greatest of all (Wisd. of Sol. 7:7), and the gifts that come from learning make us friends with God (Wisd. of Sol. 7:14). God loveth only those who dwell with wisdom, and wisdom alone shall be able to prevail against vice (Wisd. of Sol. 7:28–30). While it is true no doubt that wisdom has frequently an ethical rather than an intellectual connotation (Wisd. of Sol. 3:9, 11; 5:6; 6:9, 10; 17:1), and it has to be admitted that there are times when wisdom may perhaps be equivalent to the Law (Wisd. of Sol. 6:4, 11, 12, 18; 16:6), there are traces of that purely intellectual aspect of wisdom which could have been penned only by one quite sympathetic with Greek culture (Wisd. of Sol. 1:3, 4; 7:14–22). The culture ideal which this book embodied under the name of Solomon (Wisd. of Sol. 7:17–21) is none other than that of the cultured Alexandrian about 100 B.C. The practical expression of this, with a decidedly Hebraic coloring, is found in the cleavage between the Pharisees and the Am haarets. The Pharisee was one who was completely instructed in the Law, while the Am haarets was the uninstructed, the common man (cf. Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 190).

In Slavonic Enoch we are brought into close touch with the negative side of this doctrine. Adam's sin is explained as due to his ignorance of his own nature: "I knew his nature, he did not know his nature. Therefore his ignorance is a woe to him that he should sin" (Slav. En. 30:16). "But I cursed him for his ignorance" (Slav. En. 31:7). From these quotations it is clear that our author regarded ignorance, *per se*, as a sin, and the root of all sin. In this he had accepted the fundamental Socratic principle γνῶθι σεαυτόν. Plato, who was the great protagonist of this doctrine, maintained that no man would do wrong if he really knew it (*Phaed.* 229E, 230A; *Prot.* 345D; *Tim.* 86D; *Repub.* IX, 589C).

But the Jewish writer who makes the most complete apology in this field (aside from Philo) is the author of IV Maccabees. While holding to the general proposition that virtue and wisdom are coincident, he makes a flank movement on the Greeks and assumes that Wisdom is bound up in the laws of Israel. Wisdom "is contained in the education of the law by means of which we learn divine things reverently and human things profitably" (IV Macc. 1:15–17). "We should be disregarding our fathers if we did not obey the law" (IV Macc. 9:2). Israel must as a people be loyal to their own laws (IV Macc. 5:19), and thereby she would remain unconquered in respect to virtue (IV Macc. 9:18).

Two more brief questions, both apparently somewhat aloof from the

above treatment, yet both results of the general tendencies, remain to be considered. The first is the attitude toward truth in the abstract. With a growing subjectivity and surrounded by philosophic speculation we need not be surprised to get a glimpse of a struggle toward the ascertaining of truth. This glimpse is found in one of the earliest books. Be ashamed of lying "in regard to the truth of God" (Ecclus. 41:19). In another place the same writer tells us that "Truth will return unto them that practice in her" (Ecclus. 27:9). In Ecclus. 4:25–28, the young man is bidden to "strive for truth unto the death, and the Lord shall fight for thee." We meet essentially the same exhortations in Nic. *Ethics* iv. and Diog. *Laert.* vii. 117–19. In Tobit we meet a similar expression, which seems to be a favorite one with the author, viz., "Walking in truth" (ὁδὸς ἀληθείᾳ, Tob. 1:3; 3:5; 4:6; 8:7; 14:7).

The second question is that of the sacredness of life. There seems to have been introduced in this period not only a less desirable attitude toward woman, but also a less reverent view of life itself. In Hebrew thought life was greatly reverenced, and in the Old Testament Scriptures there is no assured case of the suicide of an Israelite (Saul; cf. I Sam. 31:4; II Sam. 1:6–10; cf. Ahithophel; II Sam. 17:14; cf. vs. 23). Even should this interpretation be doubted, it is beyond question that there is no praise for such in Scripture. In Greek thought, it is true, we find Plato asserting that one who took his life is blameworthy, because he thereby deserted a post in which he had been placed by God (*Phaed.* 6). This very comment, however, carries with it the inference that such acts were not altogether unknown, and perhaps even in Plato's day they may have had apologists. That this was the exact situation later we learn from other sources. Zeller informs us that a part of the creed of the Stoics held that it was permissible for one to take his own life (Zeller, *Stoics*, 318). This, of course, only comports with their attitude toward life in general.

This may perhaps have been the background which brought to full expression in a number of instances the Jewish ideals in that regard. In Tobit, Sarah in her despair is hindered from the fatal deed by this thought, "If I do this, it shall be a reproach unto him [her father] and I shall bring down his old age with sorrow to the grave" (Tob. 3:10). Twice in the Wisdom of Solomon the ban is put on suicide. It is the wicked men who have called it (death) to them (Wisd. of Sol. 1:16), and again we find the following exhortation, "Seek not death in the error of your life" (Wisd. of Sol. 1:12). That the crushing persecutions led

some to be sympathetic toward the Stoic influence is seen in II Maccabees. The suicide of Razis meets with the following commendation: "He fell upon his sword, choosing rather to die manfully, than to come into the hands of the wicked" (II Macc. 14:43, 44). Also in IV Maccabees the glorying in martyrdom, which is expressed so frequently, may be touched by the Stoic apathy to life (IV Macc. 9:17; 11:25; 15:15–18). In these days we learn from Josephus that suicide was far from an uncommon practice (Jos., *Jew. Wars*, III, vii, 34; IV, i, 10). To this unhappy result not only the stress of circumstances may have been a cause, but the Greek thought may also have made its contribution.

Thus we conclude that in the ethical realm there was a decided Jewish apologetic to the Greeks. While the old Hebrew ideals still obtained, and some Hebrew principles were restated more clearly than ever before, yet there was a very definite trend which would help to mediate even that which was peculiarly Jewish to the Greek mind. Some unfortunate Greek attitudes, as that toward women and life, had become the familiar property of the Jew. He also embraced the Grecian attitude toward beauty, form, fame, name, and ambition. More essential features he also appropriated. The cardinal virtues of the Stoics were ingrafted into his code, and the axiom of Plato that knowledge is virtue, he colored and translated into Judaism. While on the whole there was little coherence in his ethical system, he had assuredly become all things to all men.

D. THEOLOGY

It was not until the Greek period that the Jew came into anything like close contact with a people of speculative interests. Indeed it was not until their colony settled in Alexandria that they came face to face with those rationalizing processes which sought to prove that God was the highest perfection of which it was possible for one to think, in fact, that it was not possible for the human mind rationally to comprehend the Deity. This conclusion was the result of a long process on the part of the Greeks themselves. The fact has been preserved to us by Aristotle (*Rhet.*, II, 23, 1399) that Xenophanes had assumed that God was uncreated. But the pathway of later argument was slow and tortuous. Anaxagoras, who may be called the father of theistic theory, held that there was an original dualism. Mind and matter were opposed to each other. Mind was simple, pure, unmixed, spiritual. It was the creator of the universe, omnipotent and omniscient. Socrates made an important contribution. He taught that the gods were personal, intelligent,

and that a divine purpose was running through creation. Plato considered that the idea of the good was highest of all, and that it was the cause of all the beautiful, the parent of light, the supplier of truth, and identical with the divine man. Aristotle emphasized the conception of the transcendence of the Infinite. The Stoics, working from a monistic viewpoint, held that God was "purest body" and thus identified him with nature. They endeavored to appropriate both the teleology of Socrates and the transcendence of Aristotle. Through the doctrine of the seminal Logos they worked out a theory of evolution in which the gods were at the highest point of an ascending scale, of which matter was the lowest. This in brief suggests the type of theological thought with which the Jews came into contact.

To the Hebrew people the idea of God had been one of their earliest axioms. He *was*, and they had not sought to prove his existence. It is true that during the centuries their ideas had changed. In early days he had been the God of the tribe, declaring himself in storm and war. He had been very near to the early fathers, manifesting himself in the cloud and on the mountain. But as their tribal life gained coherence, and as their national life touched a wider world, so their ideas of their God changed. From the deity of a nomadic people, he passed to that of an agricultural nation, with a growing commerce. Under the influence of the Prophets the conception became primarily ethical, hence universal, and with the fall of the temple came the emphasis on his transcendence. Yet while the God of a small nomadic people has become the God of the universe, controlling nature and nations alike, there had been no speculation among the people as to the essential nature of deity or the *modus operandi* whereby he keeps in touch with and controls this universe. Nor were these people intellectually capable to any large degree of exercising themselves in the mazy pathways of a speculative philosophy. So while we find that many of their statements take on color from their environment, yet, on the whole, in their statement of God they passed but little beyond the conceptions of their fathers.

The emphasis on the transcendence of Deity is one of the most noticeable features of this literature. Grecian thought has thus accentuated a principle already assured to the Hebrew mind. The various names which are used for God give striking evidence of this fact. It is here to be noted that Yahweh, the early Hebrew name for their tribal Deity, is never used in the LXX. This was not alone due to reverence for the name, which later became too sacred to be pronounced by common lips, for the tetragrammaton was written in books issued after the

time of the LXX translation. It was apparently in part a repudiation of the name which was associated with the idea of a local and tribal deity, so as to meet more adequately the wider conceptions which obtained in Alexandria. In its place we now regularly find *κύριος* and *κύριος ὁ θεός*.

Out from the almost innumerable epithets which are applied to Deity in this age we shall gather only a few of the most important. The Most High (*ὕψιστος*) is one of the frequent designations. It is of frequent occurence in the LXX (Gen. 14:18, 19, 20; Deut. 32:8; Ps. 7:17; 9:2, *et al.*). In the Book of Ecclesiasticus, a translation, it is found about forty times. It has its Hebrew counterpart, עליון but the translation frequently is made to do duty for the humbler אל and for the exclusive יהוה. The same thing meets us as we move down through the literature. Found most frequently in the Twelve Patriarchs (T. Sim. 2:5; T. Levi 3:10; 4:1, 2; 5:1; T. Issa. 2:5; T. Gad 3:1; T. Asher 2:6; 5:4; 7:3; T. Jos. 1:4; 3:10; 9:3; 10:3; T. Benj. 9:2) and the Apocalypse of Baruch (21:3, *et al.*), it is also found occasionally in the Sibylline Oracles (687, 629, 735, *et al.*), the Prayer of Manasseh, Judith (13:18), II Maccabees (3:31), Wisdom of Solomon (5:15; 6:3), and the Assumption of Moses (10:7; cf. 4:2). Though some of these are translations, the fact of emphasis on the aloofness of Deity still remains.

Ruler (*Δυνάστης*), which was a term applied by the Greeks to Zeus (Soph. *Ant.* 608), is found a few times in translations (LXX Job 6:23; 15:20; Lev. 19:15; Ecclus. 46:5; 47:5, 8; 48:20), but more frequently in Greek compositions (II Macc. 3:24; 12:15, 28; 15:3, 4, 23, 29; III Macc. 2:2, *et al.*). One quotation will suffice to exhibit the tendency of the period: "The Lord of spirits and Ruler of all authority" (*ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων κύριος καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης*) is the name for Deity in II Macc. 3:24.

Absolute Ruler or Owner (*Δεσπότης*) is found frequently in the LXX, in II Maccabees (5:17, 20, *et al.*), III Maccabees (2:1; 5:12), the Wisdom of Solomon, the Psalms of Solomon, and other books.

The Greatest One (*μέγιστος*, III Macc. 1:9, 16; 5:25; 4:16), the Monarch (*μόναρχος*, III Macc. 2:1), the King of Kings (*ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλεῶν*, II Macc. 13:4, for the first time), and many other combinations all contribute to the same conception. Words such as *κύριος* and *παντοκράτωρ* are found times beyond number in the LXX and later literature. Hebrew phrases, such as the Holy One, the Creator, the Father (the All-Father is used in Sibyl. Or., III, 550), are of constant recurrence.

Phrases which are used to characterize God throw further light on the situation. Statements embracing his omnipotence and omniscience abound everywhere. He is the One who liveth forever (Ecclus. 18:1; 36:17; 42:21; Job 13:1; Sus. 42; Bel and the Drag. 5:25; Esther 16:6; II Macc. 7:33; cf. Ep. Bar. 4:22, 35; 5:2, *et al.*). The Greek designation immortal (ἀθάνατος) is the favorite term in Sibyl. Or., III, 97–829 (ll. 101, 276, 327, 672, 676, 678, *et al.*). A thoroughly Grecian expression is used in the Wisdom of Solomon: "With whose beauty if they being delighted took them to be gods; let them know how much better the Lord of them is; for the first author of beauty [ὁ γὰρ τοῦ κάλλους γενεσιάρχης] hath created them" (Wisd. of Sol. 13:3; cf. 13:5). The same idea is expressed in Ecclesiasticus: "The beauty of the heaven, the glory of the stars, ... at the command of the Holy One they will stand in their order and never faint in their watches" (Ecclus. 43:9, 10).

Perhaps in a general way there is no more illuminating illustration of the spirit of the age than the quotation of one of the prayers which has been preserved. In early Hebrew literature the prayers are marked by simplicity and directness of approach. One or two titles for Deity in the early days (Exod. 5:22; 15:11; 32:11; I Kings 8:15) gave way later to the more ornate and less direct. Three or four epithets are used in Neh. 1:5; Dan. 9:4; Ecclus. 51:1; Esther 13:9; Jud. 9:12. The climax of this tendency is seen in the Prayer of Manasseh, where eleven titles are used, and that of Jonathan, where there are fifteen. The prayer of Jonathan was after this manner: "O Lord, Lord God, Creator of all things, who art fearful and strong, and righteous and merciful, and the only and gracious King, the only giver of all things, the only just, almighty and everlasting, thou that didst deliver Israel from all trouble and didst choose the fathers, and sanctify them" (II Macc. 1:24, 25; cf. Prayer of Man., vss. 1–4; III Macc. 2:2, 3).

While a tendency to remove anthropomorphic and anthropopathic conceptions of Deity is found in the LXX and in the interbiblical literature, it is, on the one hand, by no means general and thoroughgoing, and, on the other hand, it is as truly Hebraic as Grecian. There remain, however, for our discussion, a number of characterizations which belong to the realm of pure speculation and are hence to that extent Grecian. One of the earliest fragments of the Sibylline Oracles—and this is a characteristic note of the whole Jewish collection—has an echo of the speculative thought of the times. "The sole ruler of the world, who only through eternal ages bides, the *self-existent, unbegotten One*" (Proem., First Frag., 15–17; cf. Aristotle, *Rhet.* II, 23, 1399). A similar thought,

expressed from another standpoint in II Maccabees: "Thou, O Lord, who in thyself hast no need of the universe" (Σὺ κύριε τῶν ὅλων ἀπροσδεὴς ὑπάρχων, II Macc. 14:35; cf. Dähne, *Gesch. Darst. d. jud.-alex. relig. Phil.*, II, 187), is completely out of alignment with the general Old Testament thought and is in the closest sympathy with that of the Greeks. "The one having no need of anything" (σοι τῷ τῶν ἁπάντων ἀπροσδεεί, III Macc. 2:9) expresses exactly the same idea (cf. IV Macc. 1:1; 13:16). Josephus, with the freedom of a Jewish historian, introduces this anachronism into the Prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple (Jos., *Ant.*, VIII, iii, 3). In the Wisdom of Solomon, agreeable to Greek phraseology, He is called the One who is (τὸν ὄντα, Wisd. of Sol. 13:1; cf. Apoc. Bar. 48:24; 85:14).

A number of passages should be referred to here, which, while they may not go beyond that development of thought which was germane to the Hebrews themselves, may easily have been influenced by Greek ideas. A number of these very closely approach the Platonic idea that God was unknowable in his essence: "And hardly do we guess aright at things that are upon the earth, and with labor do we find the things that are before us; but the things that are in heaven who hath searched out?" (Wisd. of Sol. 9:16; cf. 13:1; Ecclus. 42:17; 43:30, 31). "The sacred spirit who was worthy of the Lord, manifold and incomprehensible" (Assump. Mos. 11:16; cf. Apoc. Bar. 14:15; 21:10; Jud. 8:14, 16; IV Esdr. 4:7–11). "The kingdoms of the wise, great, inconceivable, and never changing God, the Lord of All, ... the unapproachable throne of the Lord" (Slav. En. *Introd.;* cf. Num. 23:19; I Sam. 15:29). The same influence may in part have affected the idea of the "incommunicable name" (Wisd. of Sol. 14:21). Similarly the avoidance of the divine name Yahweh, so rigorously observed in most of the later literature, while perhaps based in taboo because of the Hebrew conception of the relation between the name and the thing in itself, may have been accentuated in a measure, owing to the growing idea of transcendence. It is clear at least that the complete omission of any proper name for deity, as in I Maccabees, is a tribute to the influence of the Greek thought.

The Jewish doctrine of the supremacy and the solity of Deity was one which would easily gain a listening ear from the Greek. Aristeas assures his readers that the Jews worship, like all other men, the Greek God Zeus, only under a different name (vs. 15). The negative side of that tenet, the vanity of idolatry, would also be appreciatively received by them. The tirade against the idols is so constantly on the lips of these leaders, particularly those who are most thoroughly saturated in

Greek thought, that one is inclined to feel that the writers were quite aware of a Grecian audience (Tobit, Bel and the Dragon, Judith, Twelve Patriarchs, Wisdom of Solomon; cf. Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 90 f.).

The Jewish conception of the universality of God is one of the most fruitful ideas of the apocalyptic literature. Its scope is elaborated and in some cases made more definitely Grecian. The thought of the possibility of the salvation of the gentile world in whole or in part is found frequently: "Let them all [i.e., all the nations] know thee as we have also known thee" (Ecclus. 36:5) suggests the sweep of the late Jewish Wisdom-literature. Holofernes is represented as willing to serve and worship the God of the Israelites in Jud. 11:23 (cf. Jud. 9:14; Sibyl. Or., III, 614 ff.). In the Twelve Patriarchs there are many expressions of a universal outlook: "The Lord shall visit all the Gentiles in his tender mercies" (T. Levi 4:4; cf. 14:4). "And in his priesthood the Gentiles shall be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth, and enlightened through the grace of the Lord" (T. Levi 18:9; cf. 2:11; 8:14). "God shall appear on earth, to save the race of Israel, and to gather together the righteous from among the Gentiles" (T. Napht. 8:3). "He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles" (T. Asher 7:3). "And the twelve tribes shall be gathered there and all the Gentiles" (T. Benj. 9:2; cf. T. Jud. 25:5; T. Dan. 6:7; T. Sim. 6:5). The Psalms of Solomon express the same sentiment: "And he shall have mercy upon all the nations that come before him in fear" (Ps. Sol. 17:32, 38). In Enoch the same thought comes to complete expression more than once (En. 10:21; 90:28–36).

Besides the purely apocalyptic literature, which changes from a very general hope for some or all of the Gentiles in the earlier literature to a general condemnation of all Gentiles in the later literature, there are three or four striking passages which lend their weight in the direction of universality. A verse in the Testament of Levi, which is considered late by Charles, speaks of "the light which was given through the law, to lighten you and every man" (T. Levi 14:4). In the Apocalypse of Baruch we meet perhaps the clearest expression of this idea. "The judgment of the Lofty One who has no respect of persons" (Apoc. Bar. 13:8; cf. 44:4).

The thought of God's providential care for his people and his intervention on their behalf is of ancient date for the Jews. Both these ideas are accentuated here if possible. Their history writing is replete with illustrations of the marvelous way in which their God has delivered them. In order adequately to express themselves on this matter they have borrowed two terms, which to the Greeks already had a theological

significance. "Manifest signs" (ἐπιφάνεια) was a term which had been used by the Greeks of any visible appearance of a God for any purpose (Diod. i. 15; Plut., *Thom.* 30). In II Maccabees this seems to be the distinguishing characteristic of the book: "And the manifest signs that came from heaven unto those that behaved themselves manfully to their honor for Judaism" (II Macc. 2:21; cf. 3:34; 5:2–4; 10:29, 30; 11:6–11; 15:17). The author of III Maccabees has gone a step farther. The ἐπιφάνεια are more clearly distinct from God, *per se*, and are seen to function almost as δύναμις or λόγος or ἄγγελοι (III Macc. 2:9; 5:8, 35, 51; 6:9, 18, 39). Two quotations here will suffice: "Thou hast been greatly glorified in magnificent manifestation" (III Macc. 2:9). "To pity those who are standing even now at the very gate of Hades with your manifestations" (III Macc. 5:51). The tendency herein indicated is seen very clearly in a passage from Josephus. In the cleaving of the Red Sea, the activity of God is spoken of as ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ θεοῦ (Jos., *Ant.*, II, xvi, 2).

The other term is Providence (πρόνοια). The idea was an old one. But with the developing transcendence of the idea of God it was necessary that the doctrine should be more clearly formulated. The necessary word to meet the need was at hand. Πρόνοια had been used by Herodotus (iii. 108) and Plato (*Tim.* 44C; *Phaed.* 241E) for Providence. It is used in Xenophon (*Mem.* i. 4, 6) in an absolute sense for Divine Providence. The Stoics had appropriated it as a part of their working theology. Naturally it comes into use in the Jewish literature through those most closely in touch with Greek life. The Wisdom of Solomon says, "But thy providence [πρόνοια] O Father, governeth it" (i.e., the vessel at sea, Wisd. of Sol. 14:3; cf. 17:2). The author of III Maccabees, a representative of the narrowest type of Judaism, quite consistently with his general conception of divine care for Israel says, "That, however, was the work of an unconquerable providence [προνοίας ἀνικήτου] which came from heaven to the help of the Jews" (III Macc. 4:21; cf. 5:30). Again, in IV Maccabees we find it used as follows: "Through which our just and paternal Providence having become favorable to the nation will punish this persecuting tyrant" (IV Macc. 9:24).

From the above we learn that under Grecian influence native tendencies toward transcendency had been accentuated, so that some were beginning to think of God as unknowable in essence and unapproachable. The corollary of this was a complicated system of intermediaries. Greek speculation had early felt the need and had endeavored in a most systematic and philosophic way to bridge the gulf

between the unknown and the known. Between the reaction of opposites, which was the function of the Logos of Heraclitus and the seminal Logos of the Stoics there had been many suggested hypotheses. All alike, however, were agreed as to the need of some gradual approach between spirit and matter. Plato presents one of the most complete systems, and yet he has not adequately worked out the causal nexus between his world of ideas and the actual world. He conceived the cosmos to be a living being endowed with a cosmical soul, through which relation was established and controlled between the two worlds. That all-pervading principle he named νοῦς or λόγος. The Stoics who identified God with nature worked out a theory of rational evolution. In their pantheistic system the universal λόγος which was known under many names subordinated to itself or expressed itself through the seminal λόγοι, and these by the applied physics of Heraclitus were the efficient cause of all things. Thus there was a gradual movement from the lower to the higher from the material standpoint, and a gradual movement from the higher to the lower from the intellectual standpoint.

As the idea of transcendence of Deity was an inner development of Hebrew thought itself, so also the conception of intermediaries was not foreign to it. Even in the earliest literature traces are still preserved which indicate that to the popular mind there were supernatural beings besides Yahweh. In the well-defined remnant of mythology found in Genesis, we have the conception of celestial beings who seem to be in measure independent of Yahweh (Gen. 6:1–4). In Joshua the host of Yahweh, captained by his prince, is ready to fight the battles of Israel (Josh. 5:14). In a very remarkable picture in the Book of Kings, what may have been a very common belief is accredited to Micaiah the prophet. He saw the council in heaven, in which Yahweh was seated on his throne and surrounded by all the host of heaven who were ministering servants (I Kings 22:19). A poetic suggestion behind which there may lie a wealth of popular angelology is found in the Seraphim in the vision of Isaiah (Isa., chap. 6). True, the glimpses are but few, but that even so many were preserved in spite of the trenchant prophetic dogma of practical monotheism is indicative of the original abundance and persistence of such material. In the post-exilic age we see the re-emergence of the same idea. Following Isaiah and Ezekiel the need of mediation is felt. Even Ezekiel is guided by a supernatural being (Ezek. 40:3). To Zechariah there must be sent the Angel of Yahweh, as the interpreter of his visions (Zech. 1:11, *et al.*), and Satan functions as the Adversary of Israel (Zech. 3:1, 2). In Job there is a heavenly council,

and Satan, while apparently a member of the council, performs a service which is inimical to man. In Isa. 24:21, "the host of the height," and in Dan. 4:17, "the watchers," we have part of the nomenclature for supernatural beings which is found in contemporary literature.

In the Grecian period the development of the idea of intermediaries diverges in two directions. The one is along the line of angelology. This was largely Jewish, though considerable of the coloring came from Persia. The stress of the times no doubt contributed to accelerate the movement. The dualism in the angel world becomes complete. The heavenly hosts are divided into two groups: the evil and the good. They are arranged in ranks and are organized for service. They have charge of individuals and the oversight of nations, and there are even those which control some of the functions of nature. Like human beings they have names, most of which are Hebrew. Thus from the side of angelology the idea of intermediaries is well developed.

A more abstract turn was given by Greek philosophy. The Logos speculation won its way into the minds of at least a few of the Jewish thinkers. It seems probable that before the close of the Old Testament Canon this influence was felt. Should Wisdom in Prov., chap. 8, be nothing more than a vivid personification, yet a strong reflection of Greek thought has colored the description and the ideal. It is admitted that the early Semitic thought did not lack the element of hypostatization. In Sippar, Justice and Integrity were called the children of Shamash (Schrader, *K.A.T.* 3, 368 f.). Likewise Persia had its hypostatization, and expressly called it Wisdom (Tiele, *Gesch. d. Relig. im Alterth.*, II, 1, 147–50). In many respects it seems that the Persian idea resembled that of the Hebrews. While the genetic relation of the Babylonian and Persian thought to that of the Greeks, and in turn to that of the Hebrews, is a subject of considerable dispute, the fact remains however that it was not until the Jews came into the closest contact with the Greeks that this speculation became a part of their thinking. Thus we find the practical aims of the Hebrews clothing themselves in the mold of Greek culture (Prov. 8:14–21). Greek speculation at least assisted to push Wisdom back into that realm of time before the world was (Prov. 8:22–29). Should the accumulation of epithets and characterizations, and the uncertain translation "nurseling" (אמון, Prov. 8:29) not be sufficient to prove hypostatization, they certainly show Greek influence, direct or indirect, and very adequately prepare the way for later development.

Our conclusion in regard to Wisdom (σοφία) in Ecclesiasticus must

be practically the same. Here Wisdom came from the Most High as the firstborn of the creatures (Ecclus. 1:4; 24:1–7), and was the mold for all the works of God. She was poured out upon all nations, but took up her special abode with Israel (24:8–10). At times she seems to fall little short of an intermediary between God and man, and often appears to parallel the function of the λόγος of the Greeks. This thought is, however, not consistent throughout, and we are compelled to stop short of certainty as to her hypostasis (cf. Bousset, *Relig. d. Jud.*, 139). The conception in the Book of Baruch is so apparently influenced by Ecclesiasticus, without presenting any further development, that we need pay no attention to it (Bar. 3:9–13, 27–32).

Until the time of Philo, the chief exponent of Grecian thought in respect to Wisdom is the author of the Wisdom of Solomon. To him Wisdom is a master-workman (τεχνίτης): "For wisdom which is the worker of all things taught me (ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτης ἐδίδαξε μὲ σοφία, Wisd. of Sol. 7:22). Again he questions, "What is richer than wisdom that worketh all things?" (τῆς τὰ πάντα ἐργαζομένης, Wisd. of Sol. 8:5; cf. 18:6). The thirteenth chapter opens with an utterance which is not easy to interpret. The important part of the statement is "Neither by considering the works did they acknowledge the master-workman" (τὸν τεχνίτην). The dilemma is as to whether it is God or Wisdom who is referred to here. Our conclusion is, however, supported by either interpretation. Should τεχνίτης, which has previously been applied to Wisdom, here be applied to Deity, then we must recognize God as the efficient cause (so Wisd. of Sol. 1:14; 6:7; 9:1, 9) and Wisdom as the actual agent in the world-creation. On the other hand, if we interpret this as Wisdom, we then have another case in which she is set over against God. To her is attributed the power to do all things (Wisd. of Sol. 7:22–30; 8:1, 5). She has been with God in all his work, operating as his instrument (Wisd. of Sol. 9:9; 11:24). The same idea is again expressed in Slavonic Enoch (Slav. En. 30:8, 12; 33:3, 4; 48:4), and is essential to Philo's system. She is represented as penetrating all things (Wisd. of Sol. 7:24; 8:1, 7; 7:27). In this respect she seems to be synonymous with the spirit of the Lord (πνεῦμα κυρίου) which filleth the world (Wisd. of Sol. 1:7; cf. 1:6; 8:1). Here Greek phraseology has been adopted as well as Greek thought. Similar expressions and thought occur in Plato (*Gorg.* 508A; *Iren.*, V, 23), Aristotle (*De Mundo*, 6), Xen. (*Anab.* vii. 2, 8), and later very frequently in Philo (cf. Wace. *Apoc.*, I, 427). By many other characterizations she seems to be the chief ministrant, or even the Spirit of

God. With him she is living (Wisd. of Sol. 8:3). She knows the mysteries of God (Wisd. of Sol. 8:4; 9:9, 11). She is his firstborn (μονογενής, Wisd. of Sol. 7:22; cf. 7:27). She is the breath (ἀτμίς), a pure influence (ἀπόῤῥοια) flowing from his glory (Wisd. of Sol. 7:25), and she is the everlasting light and the mirror of the power of God (Wisd. of Sol. 7:26). Further, in this remarkable chapter (Wisd. of Sol. 7:22–30) we meet twenty-one characterizations of Wisdom, some of rather vague significance, many of them coming from the realm of Greek speculation, and the combination bringing vividly to memory the twenty-six epithets by which the Stoic Kleanthes described "the Good" (Euseb., *Praep. evang.*, XIII, 3; cf. Grimm, *Comm.*, 158, and Deane, *Book of Wisd.*, 10).

While Wisdom is seated on the throne at the side of God, and is his master-workman accomplishing his will, she has also a special function with men. She is universally accessible to all who love and seek her (Wisd. of Sol. 6:12–15). She has saved or will save the world (Wisd. of Sol. 6:21; 10:1–20; 9:18). It is through her that there may come all desirable gifts. She gives mirth and joy; immortality and riches and prudence come from her (Wisd. of Sol. 8:16–21). Fame and authority and an everlasting name are likewise bestowals from her hands (Wisd. of Sol. 8:10–15). So from the cumulative evidence we are forced to conclude that in one strand of this book, Wisdom is considered an essence separate from God, which functions as an intermediary between God and man. We might even go farther, and, because of the predicates which are used of the λόγος of God, viz., creation (Wisd. of Sol. 9:1), and the agent of the plague (Wisd. of Sol. 18:15; cf. 10:15), we might be justified in finding in σοφία a Hebraic equation for the Grecian λόγος. To the Greek thinkers who read the book, this would be the most natural interpretation.

Under the God idea, that which last claims our attention is the conception of revelation. The Hebrew conception had not been uniform throughout. The early prophets had an overwhelming conviction that they were the recipients of a direct communication from God. The psychological processes are not explained, but they permit of no interpretation which suggests any intervention between these men and Deity. Later prophets, owing to changing conceptions as well perhaps as more moderate convictions, were guided in the pathways of truth by angels or messengers of God (Ezekiel, Zechariah). Still later writers busied themselves chiefly with the interpretation of the past in terms of the present (Chronicles, Priest Code). From the beginning of the second

century B.C., owing to the accumulated sorrows which were moving to their climax under Greek rule, there is found an abundance of apocalyptic literature. Inspired by messages of the past, in form and color a combination of Hebrew and Persian, this literature seems hardly conscious of the Greek culture by which it was surrounded.

The Greeks themselves were not without a conception of revelation. While essentially quite different, perhaps that which came nearest to the high-water mark of the Hebrew people finds its best illustration in Socrates, who was conscious of the constant presence of an inner guiding spirit. In general the two peoples followed quite different lines. A distinct cleavage is again noted in Greek thought itself; while the terms should not be applied too rigidly, popular and philosophic may be used to designate these two different dispositions. The popular idea found its answer in oracle-giving and soothsaying. This is a conception which obtains among all primitive people, the Hebrews included. In Israel, however, the ban had been put on it by the ethical ministry of the Prophets, and it had fallen into disrepute among the religious leaders. Now under Greek influence it is rehabilitated. Not only is it in the mouth of the Sibyl that oracles favorable to the Jew and his religion are sought, but fictitious oracle-giving becomes a systematic practice, which gains the favor of some of the best and most religious leaders of the nation. The author of Daniel was a man of lofty aspirations and sterling convictions. The writer of the book of the celestial physics (En., chaps. 72–82) was no mean speculator in his time. There were perhaps few men of keener moral sensibilities than the one who put the oracles of the future in the mouths of the Twelve Patriarchs. When it is noted that perhaps half of the literature of this period has assumed this oracular guise we can appreciate the strength of that influence which assisted in its re-emergence.

The other line of Greek influence, namely, the contribution of the schools, was much more subtle and far-reaching. Greek philosophy, with its many inner antagonisms was at least agreed in this, that all knowledge must be attained rationally through some inner relation to the system of the universe itself. For "revelation" as such they had no place in their pre-Alexandrian systems.[1] With Plato and his followers the measure of harmony with the archetypal idea of the good was the measure of the rational development of the man. The "world-soul" was to them the determining principle of all knowledge. The Stoics

[1] As the movements of the Sophists and the Skeptics had no influence on our literature, they need not here engage our attention.

held that just in proportion as the λόγος in the individual attained a correspondence to the universal reason or common ideas (κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι) it attained to the truth. To them law (νόμος) and nature (φύσις) were essentially synonymous terms. While it is true that there were movements in Hellenistic thought which later expressed their logical conclusion in such a phrase as "divine revelation is the highest source of knowledge," in the period of our study, reason, law, and nature were the categories of the highest authority.

The dissimilarity of this with the Hebrew conception is at once apparent. Pressed on every side by this foreign teaching which threatened to subvert the very foundations of their religion, the Jews met the need of the situation by two different methods of approach. The first, which was the full accrediting of the media of revelation, is purely objective, and is certainly Jewish rather than Greek. It is the dogmatic strengthening of their old position, to which they were forced by the speculations of their opponents. The second is the accrediting of the revelation through an appeal to its content, and is Grecian rather than Jewish.

The Jew not only assumed but asserted that there was a need of a divine revelation. That there are mysteries which the human mind cannot fathom is asserted in the Old Testament: "Man cannot find out the work that God hath done from the beginning even to the end" (Eccles. 3:11; cf. 7:24). The mysteries of the unknown and the desire to gain some glimpses into it are constantly reiterated in the apocryphal writers (cf. especially IV Esdr., chaps. 3–5, 19; Ecclus. 16:17–23; 18:4–7; 24:28; 42:17–25; 39:16–21). In the past such revelation had come through certain outstanding individuals in their national history. The use of these time-honored names as pseudonyms is one of the conspicuous attempts to defend revelation from the standpoint of external authority. The plethora of pseudepigraphy of this period cannot be recognized as merely the elaboration and development of the ideas and systems of the men whose names they now bear. It is true the names were usually chosen because of some special fitness between the name and the content of the writing. But yet we must admit that these books were "tracts for the times," to which were attached names, reverenced in Israel and not unknown in the pagan world, for the express purpose of gaining a hearing for the message. Enoch, Noah, Baruch, the Sibyl, the Twelve Patriarchs, Daniel, Solomon, Ezra, Moses, and Isaiah were *noms de plumes* with which the *literati* of Judaism conjured in these dark days. Many of these were

great religious teachers far from strange to the ears of the cultured Greek community.

In the closing of the Old Testament Canon, one name, and that because of personal worth, had in respect to things of the law gained a pre-eminence, viz., Moses. The strength of this tradition is indicated in the latest historical books of the Old Testament (Ezra. 6:18, *et al.;* cf. Mal. 4:4). That tradition is now assumed by the Jewish defenders of the faith, and the need of a revelation and the peculiar fitness of this name to be the bearer of that revelation are duly emphasized. Law, and this we shall take up later, is identified with that desired knowledge. Moses, thus, as the original giver of that law, became a *sine qua non* of Jewish literary thought. To prove his unique fitness to be the channel of such a revelation is a task which was attempted by many minds. Ben Sirach, if we can trust the rendering of the Hebrew text, compared him with the angels (כאלהים, Eccles. 45:2; cf. Wisd. of Sol. 10:16). Ezekiel the dramatist and Eupolemus sought to prove him the instructor of his people in the arts and sciences (Euseb., *Praep. evang.*, IX, 28, 26). Artapanus identified him with Musaeus, the great teacher of Orphaeus. Josephus calls him the one "next to God" (Jos., *Jew. Wars*, II, 8, 9; cf. Jos., *Ant.*, III, xv, 3). Philo held him to be the Master of all philosophies, and sought to deduce from the Pentateuch a detailed Grecian philosophy (*De Vita Mos.*, 1, 6). Many are the Haggadoth which describe in varying detail the ascent of Moses into the heaven and how he received the Torah from God (*Yoma*). One of the evidences for his claim as revealer, which is Grecian—perhaps influenced from the farther East—rather than Hebrew, is that of his pre-existence. The passage which thus fully accredits him to this high office is found in the Assumption of Moses: "But he was not pleased to manifest this purpose of creation from the creation of the world, in order that the Gentiles might thereby be convicted, yea to their own humiliation might by their arguments convict one another. Accordingly he designed and devised me, and he prepared me from before the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator of his covenant. And now I declare unto thee . . . . and receive thou this writing that thou mayest know how to preserve the books which I shall deliver unto thee" (Assump. Mos. 1:13–16; cf. 10:11; 11:1).

The effort to assure the credibility of the medium of revelation is supplemented from two different quarters. The Book of Jubilees traces the course of divine revelation from the time of Moses back to the very beginning and asserts that the law is a copy of that which is written on the heavenly tablets. Traditions of the divine laws were handed down

through Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, who was given the gift of understanding the Hebrew speech in order "that he might hear and speak with the language which had been revealed" (Jub. 12:25), and his descendants, and then later, for the sake of the greater accuracy, written in heaven by the "angel of the presence" and given to Moses (Jub. 1:4–6, 27–28; 3:10, 14, 31; 7:20, 38, 39; 8:11; 23:32; *et al.;* cf. Sibyl. Or., III, 256, 580, 600).

Another source of danger to the supernatural message, namely, the errors arising through the transmission of the manuscript, is safeguarded by another well-known theory. Ezra in a psychological state, induced by a prepared drink, dictates to five scribes for a period of forty days and thus under the mechanical guidance of the Holy Spirit the twenty-four books of the Old Testament Canon, as well as seventy others, were prepared (IV Ezra 14:37–48). The observance of the law which was thus intrusted to the keeping of the chosen people has been, on the one hand, supernaturally enforced (II Macc. 3:24–27; Twelve Patr. T. Reub. 1:7, 8; T. Sim. 2:12; T. Jud. 10:2–5; 11:5; T. Gad 5:9; T. Benj. 2:4), and, on the other hand, has been supernaturally guarded by Providence—the *πρόνοια* of the Stoics (III Macc. 2:21; 4:2; 5:26–28; 6:18–21).

There are, however, traces of movements along other directions which were much more thoroughly Grecian. Under terminology such as "Son of man," "angel," the Holy Spirit and Wisdom (*σοφία*) we find the quasi-philosophical Hebraic equation for the *νοῦς* or the *λόγος* of the Greeks. Through these manifestations or existences the Hebrews endeavor to rationalize their revelation idea. A few quotations will suffice to illustrate this fact. This conception is put very clearly in Enoch, "This is the Son of man who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of Spirits hath surpassed everything in uprightness forever" (En. 46:3). Similar in import is another characterization from the same author: "And in him dwells the spirit of wisdom and the spirit of Him who gives knowledge" (En. 49:3). The function of the angels in regard to revelation need here only be referred to. They were the official guides of the apocalyptists from the time of Zechariah on. One of them, Ramiel, is represented as the one who presides over true visions (Apoc. Bar. 55:3; 63:6). The place of *σοφία*, however, is in this respect especially important. In the Wisdom of Solomon she it was who, because of her understanding spirit, taught the author all things either

secret or manifest (Wisd. of Sol. 7:21, 22). It is through the spirit of wisdom entering holy souls that they become friends of God and prophets (Wisd. of Sol. 7:27). The counsel of God cannot be known save through wisdom and the Holy Spirit from above (Wisd. of Sol. 9:17). In the Epistle of Baruch σοφία is immanent in the book of the commandments of God (Bar. 3:9; 4:4).

Contributing to the same line of thought is the idea which became a dogma of Judaism. Twice in the Apocalypse of Baruch we are told of the voice coming from heaven bearing a revelation. The first time it reads: "A voice came from the height and said unto me . . . . hear the word of the mighty God" (Apoc. Bar. 13:1, 2). More vivid is the second declaration: "The heavens were opened . . . . and a voice was heard from high and said unto me" (Apoc. Bar. 22:1; cf. Matt. 3:17; Rev. 4:1). Thus in a variety of ways did the Jews endeavor to strengthen the external claims to revelation.

The second method of readjustment to the Greek thought, in the matter of revelation, was the appeal to content. This was rational and Hellenistic. With commendable unanimity they assume or seek to prove that the Jewish law meets all possible requirements. To Ben Sirach the pathway to true wisdom lay through the law: "If thou desire wisdom, keep the commandments" (Ecclus. 1:26). "Let thy mind dwell upon the ordinances of the Lord, and meditate continually in his commandments; . . . . and thy desire of wisdom shall be given unto thee" (Ecclus. 6:37). Human wisdom and the law are to this author practically synonymous terms: "All wisdom is the fear of the Lord; and in all wisdom is the doing of the Law" (Ecclus. 19:20). "Not so he that hath applied his soul, and meditateth in the law of the Most High; he will seek out the wisdom of the ancients" (Ecclus. 39:1). The fruit of wisdom is found in the law: "All these things [enumerated in Ecclus. 24:1–22] are the book of the covenant of the Most High God, even the law which Moses commanded us for a heritage" (Ecclus. 24:23). Thus we see that a book touched most deeply by the Grecian culture-movement is thoroughly saturated with a respect and love for the law. In the addition to Esther, the Jews are spoken of as "no evil-doers, but live by most just laws" (Esth. 16:15), and in III Maccabees the law of the Jews, when consistently followed out, makes good and faithful citizens: "But the Jews maintained toward their Kings good will and unswerving loyalty; yet as they worshipped God and governed themselves according to his law . . . . they appeared odious to some persons. But since they adorned their intercourse with one another with the good

works of the righteous, they had established themselves in the good opinion of all men" (III Macc. 3:4–6; cf. 1:9; 7:10–12). In IV Maccabees the Jewish law is asserted to be right reason (λογισμός). Through the divine law alone can the persecuted people retain right reason unsubdued (IV Macc. 11:23). When a man is obedient to the law through right reason he becomes a careful husbandman, a controller of his passions, a dutiful son, an affectionate husband, a wise parent, a good master, and one whose whole course is dominated by virtue (IV Macc. 2:9–23; cf. 5:15–18). Further, this law which is divine is found only in the writings of Moses (IV Macc. 9:2; 5:34; 2:9; 11:5). Wisdom is immanent in Jewish law according to Baruch (Bar. 3:9–14; 4:1), as also in the Apocalypse of Baruch (Apoc. Bar. 51:3, 7; 61:4; 59:7). The synonymous parallelism found in the Apocalypse of Baruch will suffice to illustrate the statement: "Also as for the glory of those who have now been justified in my law, who have had understanding in their life, and who have planted in their hearts the roots of wisdom" (Apoc. Bar. 51:3, 4). There are innumerable passages from almost every quarter which insist that the law is the only true standard of life (I Macc. 4:42–52; Ps. Sol. 9:7–9; 1:7–9; 2:3; 8:12; 10:5; 14:1–4; 18:9; Wisd. of Sol. 18:4, 9; 16:6; Aristeas, vs. 31; I Esdr. 5:47–53; 8:7–24; 9:39–41, *et al.*), and obedience to it is constantly represented as essential for all (Twelve Patr. T. Levi 14:4; I Macc. 1:34–39; 2:21–27, 34; II Macc. 4:17; 6:6, 23; 8:26; 12:38; Bar. 4:13; IV Esdr. 7:37–39).

Another line of argument adopted in defense of the law was that, not only as we have seen, was it from the foundation of the earth, but it was also valid for all eternity. This is particularly true in Jubilees (Jub. 2:18; 3:31; 6:14; 15:25; 33:16), in Enoch (En. 99:2; 103:4), and in the Apocalypse of Baruch (Apoc. Bar. 17:4; 3:6; 59:3–6; 84:2–3). Likewise in the Epistle of Baruch it is spoken of as enduring forever (Bar. 1:17–20; 2:1, 2; 2:20–24).

In respect to the doctrines of God, Intermediaries, and Revelation we would thus conclude that while no Jew within the scope of our study presented anything like a harmonious philosophical system, yet among them were those who had appropriated many of the Greek forms of speech and categories of thought. A transcendent God was conceived of as unknowable and immovable. Intermediaries to maintain the relation between God and the world were necessary, and what was almost the same as the λόγος of the Greeks is found in Jewish thought under varying names. An attempt is made to bring their doctrine of revelation

into harmony with surrounding thought. Some develop the popular and primitive side of religion in the idea of oracle-giving. Others approach more or less closely to the thought that the criteria of truth are found in the universal reason. They thus seek to prove the universal validity of the law by its content, and work out, in a semi-philosophic way, though quite imperfectly, the media through which that revelation could consistently come. These not altogether successful attempts of the Hebraist to converse in the philosophic formulae of the Hellenist point to the way in which the great Alexandrian Jew of the first century of the Christian era thought and taught.